

ANCIENT LIVES OF VERGIL

WITH AN ESSAY ON THE

POEMS OF VERGIL

IN CONNECTION WITH HIS LIFE AND TIMES

BY

H. NETTLESHIP, M.A.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

M DCCC LXXIX

[*All rights reserved*]

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.

PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



LONDON, EDINBURGH, AND NEW YORK

PREFACE.

THE following essay is based upon two public lectures delivered in the hall of Corpus Christi College in the October Term of 1878. In illustration of it I have thought it advisable to print four ancient lives of Vergil, those namely which bear the names of Probus, Donatus, and Servius, with one taken from two Berne MSS. assigned (at the latest) to the tenth century. This Life is printed by Reifferscheid in his *Suetoni Tranquilli praefer Caesarum libros reliquiae*, and by Hagen in his edition of the Berne scholia on the Eclogues and Bucolics (*Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Suppl. Band iv. Heft 5).

I have printed the memoir attributed to Probus nearly as it is edited by Keil on the basis of two fifteenth-century MSS. and the *editio princeps* of Probus' commentary on Vergil, adding a few notes where comment appeared necessary.

The Life attributed to Donatus exists, as is well known, in an interpolated and an uninterpolated form. The interpolated version, containing a mass of apocryphal matter which must have gathered shape in the course of centuries, is now generally acknowledged to have assumed its present form before the invention of printing. The vulgate as printed by Reifferscheid, mainly from the Venice edition of 1558, exhibits differences from the earlier recension which in Hagen's opinion are due to the first printer of the work (*Jahrbücher*, &c. p. 680). The text of the uninterpolated memoir was based by Daniel, and recently by Reifferscheid, on a Berne MS. of the tenth century (*B* 172). But Hagen has brought to light a far superior recension, that of a St. Gallen MS., also of the tenth century (*G*), which he has rightly taken as the foundation of his text. *B* 172

appears, according to Hagen's report, to have been corrected in a great many places from a copy representing the same recension as *G*.

The St. Gallen recension is represented in three fifteenth-century MSS. of the interpolated memoir, a Berne MS. collated by Hagen and called by him *B* 527, and two Oxford MSS. collated, as far as I know, for the first time by myself, whose readings correspond remarkably with those of *B* 527, though one important difference (see § 17) shews that they were not copied from the same original. Of the two Oxford MSS., whose readings are nearly identical throughout, by far the better is *Canonicianus* 61 (*Can.*). This MS. contains the whole of Vergil with the interpolated Life prefixed. At the end of the volume is the following *scriptio*: 'Τέλος. Leoninus Brembatus Rodigii' (Rodigo near Mantua) 'MCCCCXXXVIII.' The other MS. (*C.*) is in the Library of Corpus Christi College, in a volume containing also the epitome *de viris illustribus*, Sextus Rufus' *Romana Historia*, and lives of Plato, Demosthenes, and Cicero. This manuscript contains a memorandum stating that it was bought in London by the Bishop of Durham (John Shirwood) in 1469. It was given to the College by its founder, Richard Fox.

The orthography of the *Canonicianus* is good, as will be seen from the specimens I have given of its readings.

The Berne recension is represented also by a Paris MS. of the ninth century (Pithoeanus, Paris. Suppl. Lat. 1011), whose readings are given by Hagen. Following Hagen I call this MS. *P*.

I have written a short commentary, with an *apparatus criticus*, on the Life attributed to Donatus, partly in order to explain my reasons for differing, where I do differ, from Hagen and Ribbeck, partly to support by detailed illustration the view which I have maintained in the essay (p. 28 foll.) that the work is from the hand of Suetonius. This theory, first advanced, as far as I know, by Johann Gerhard Voss in a note on Velleius Paterculus, 2. 103 (edition of 1687), and afterwards supported by J. F. Gronovius, whose notes I have read in Burmann's Vergil of 1746, is now

generally accepted. But I am not aware that the coincidences between the style and language of our memoir and those of Suetonius have ever been exhibited with the minuteness of detail which they deserve. Some of them I have pointed out in the essay, many more in the commentary, in which I have endeavoured to advance further on the line indicated by Gronovius. I have consulted Heyne's commentary throughout, but without obtaining much light from it on questions of criticism. When I mention Ribbeck's name in my notes, I refer to his views expressed in the *Prolegomena* to his large critical edition of Vergil, and in the essay prefixed to his text published in the Teubner series.

I have also printed the Life prefixed to the commentary of Servius, adding a few notes, chiefly with the view of shewing how far it is dependent on the work of Suetonius. The text I have based on that of Thilo, the first volume of whose Servius has just appeared. In addition to the readings of Thilo's MSS., of which I have quoted the most important, I have given those of a Harleian MS. (2782) assigned to the ninth century, which does not appear to have been collated by any editor of Servius. In this MS. the Life of Vergil is prefixed to the commentary on the Aeneid, and part of it repeated, with some slight variations of wording, before the commentary on the Eclogues; one of these variations, *adeo verecundus* for *adeo verecundissimus*, I have adopted. The Berne memoir, which I have printed last, is important only as containing the statement that Vergil attended the lectures of Epidius.

The verses of Focas I have not thought it worth while to print, as they merely reproduce in a metrical form the information given by Suetonius.

H. N.

December, 1878.

I.

LIFE PREFIXED TO THE COMMENTARY OF VALERIUS PROBUS.

P. Vergilius Maro natus est idibus Octobribus Crasso et Pompeio consulibus matre Magia¹ Polla patre Vergilio rustico in vico Andibus, qui abest a Mantua milia passuum XXX², tenui facultate nutritus. Sed cum iam summis eloquentiae doctoribus vacaret, in belli civilis tempora incidit, quod Augustus adversus Antonium gessit, primumque post Mutinense bellum³ veteranis [agri eius⁴ distributi sunt]: postea restitutus beneficio Alfeni Vari Asinii Pollionis et Cornelii Galli, quibus in Bucolicis adulatur, deinde per gratiam Maecenatis in amicitiam Caesaris ductus est.

Vixit pluribus annis liberali in otio, secutus Epicuri sectam⁵, insigni concordia et familiaritate usus Quintili⁶ Tuccae et Vari. Scripsit bucolica annos natus VIII et XX Theocritum secutus, georgica Hesiodum et Varronem. Aeneida ingressus bello Cantabrico⁷... hoc quoque magna industria. Ab Augusto⁸ usque ad sestertium centiens honestatus est. Decessit in Calabria annum agens quinquagesimum heredibus Augusto et

¹ *Magia*: hence, probably, in part, the middle age legend which made Vergil a *magus*.

² *milia passuum XXX*: see Essay, p. 33.

³ *post Mutinense bellum*: a grave historical mistake; for the events referred to did not take place till after Philippi.

⁴ *agri eius*: the words in brackets are inserted by Keil. For the facts, comp. Suetonius, 19.

⁵ *secutus Epicuri sectam*: these words probably refer rather to his quiet manner of life than to his opinions; but see also Essay, p. 37.

⁶ *Quintili*, i. e. Quintilius Varus, the great friend of Horace and Vergil: Horace, Od. 1. 24, A. P. 438.

⁷ *bello Cantabrico*, 26 and 25 B.C. See Suetonius, 31. The text is here corrupt; Keil has marked a *lacuna* before *hoc quoque*. I suppose that something must have been said about Vergil's imitation of Homer, to balance what the biographer remarks about Theocritus and Hesiod.

⁸ *ab Augusto*, &c. Compare Suetonius, 13.

Maecenate cum Proculo minore fratre. In cuius sepulcro¹ quod est in via Puteolana hoc legitur epigramma :

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc

Parthenope : cecini pascua, rura, duces.

Aeneis servata ab Augusto, quamvis ipse testamento damnaverit, ne quid eorum quod non edidisset extaret : [quod et Servius Maurus² hoc testatur epigrammate :

Iusserat haec rapidis aboleri carmina flammis

Vergilius, Phrygium quae cecinere ducem :

Tucca vetat Variusque, simul tu, maxime Caesar,

Non tibi sed Latiae consulis historiae].

II.

LIFE BY SUETONIUS, ORIGINALLY PREFIXED TO THE
COMMENTARY BY AELIUS DONATUS, AND
USUALLY ATTRIBUTED TO HIM.

G. = Sangallensis 862 saeculi decimi.

B 527. = Bernensis saeculi xv ineuntis.

Can. = Canonicianus anni MCCCCXXXVIII.

C. = Codex Collegii Corporis Christi emptus Londinii anno MCCCCLVIII.

B. = Bernensis 172 saeculi decimi.

P. = Pitheoeanus saeculi noni (Paris. Suppl. Lat. 1011).

Vulg. = Vulgata ad editionem Venetam anni MDLVIII a Reifferscheidio constituta.

1. Publius Vergilius Maro Mantuanus³ parentibus modicis⁴ fuit ac praecipue patre, quem quidem opificem figulum, plures Magi cuiusdam viatoris initio mercennarium, mox ob industriam

1. *ac praecipue.* et *Can. C.* coemundis *Can. C.* *substantiae reculam* ; sic *codd.* nonne scribendum est *substantiam reculae* ? Tac. Dial. 8 *substantiam facultatum.*

¹ *In cuius sepulcro*, so the MSS. : *in eius* Keil.

² *Servius Maurus* Otto Jahn, *Servius Varus* MSS. The lines were really by Sulpicius Apollinaris, Suetonius 38, where see note. If Jahn's emendation be right, the words from *quod et—historiae* cannot belong to the memoir by Probus.

³ *Publius Vergilius Maro Mantuanus* : comp. Suetonius De Grammaticis 9, L. Orbilius Pupillus Beneventanus ; 23, Q. Remmius Palaemon Vicetinus ; 24, M. Valerius Probus Berytius ; De Rhet. 6, C. Albucius Silus Novarensis ; Deperd. Libr. Rell. p. 291 Roth, Pacuvius Brundisius, P. Terentius Karthaginiensis ; p. 295, L. Pomponius Bononiensis ; p. 296, Cornelius Gallus Foro-Julienensis ; p. 297, Q. Horatius Flaccus Venusinus.

⁴ *modicis*, humble : Hor. Od. 1. 20. 1 : 'modicis cantharis ;' S. 1. 5. 2 : 'hospitio modico ;' Epist. 1. 5. 2 : 'modica patella ;' Tac. A. 6. 39 : 'modicus originis ;'

generum tradiderunt, egregieque substantiae¹ silvis coemendis² et apibus curandis auxisse reculam. 2. Natus est Cn. Pompeio³ Magno M. Licinio Crasso primum consulibus iduum Octobrium die in pago qui Andes dicitur et abest a Mantua non procul⁴. 3. Praegnans⁵ eo mater somniavit enixam se laureum rimum, quem contactu terrae coaluisse et excrevisse ilico in speciem maturae arboris refertaeque variis pomis et floribus, ac sequenti luce cum marito rus propinquum⁶ petens ex itinere devertit atque in subiecta fossa⁷ partu levata est.

4. Ferunt infantem ut sit editus neque vagisse et adeo miti vultu fuisse ut haud dubiam spem prosperioris geniturae⁸ iam tum daret⁹. 5. Accessit aliud praesagium, siquidem¹⁰ virga populea more regionis in puerperiis eodem statim loco depacta ita

egregie substantiae *om. Can. C.* 2. Cn. Pompeio Magno [et] M. Licinio Crasso *G. Cn. Pompeio Magno et M. Licinio Crasso B. P. Can. C. Et abest: qui abest Can. C.* 3. praegnans mater Maia quom somniasset *Can. C. (cum C.) contactu G. compactu B 527. compactum Can. C. contracta terra B. ilico Can. refertae variis Can. C.* 4. cum sit *Reifferscheid. ut sit codd. vagiisse Can. C. iam duraret G. iam tum daret B. P. iam tum indicaret Can. C.* 5. accessit *vel accessit et Gronovius. et accessit libri. ita brevi [tempore] evaluit*

Suet. Nero 48: 'modica culcita;' Aug. 6: 'locus in avito suburbano permodicus et cellae penuariae instar.' For the facts comp. Life by Probus: 'matre Magia Polla patre rustico . . . tenui facultate nutritus.' The critic in Macrobius, 5. 2. 1, speaks of Vergil as 'Veneto inter silvas et frutices educto.'

¹ substantiae reculam: see critical note.

² silvis coemendis: see Essay, p. 33.

³ Cn. Pompeio, &c.: i.e. B.C. 70. The same date is given in the Life by Probus, who speaks however of Andes as a *vicus*, not a *pagus*. Andes is the name of a Gallic tribe in Caes. B. G. 2. 35 and elsewhere.

⁴ non procul: Essay, p. 33.

⁵ Similar omens from dreams are mentioned, Suetonius, Iul. 7: 'Augustus 94 Atia priusquam pareret somniavit intestina sua ferri ad sidera . . . somniavit et pater Octavius utero Atiae iubar solis exortum;' compare Domit. 23.

⁶ rus propinquum, a neighbouring estate. Iuv. 14. 141: 'cum rus non sufficit unum.'

⁷ subiecta fossa: Suetonius, Nero, 48: 'aquam ex subiecta lacuna hausit' (J. F. Gronovius).

⁸ genitura, horoscope: Sueton. Aug. 94. Cal. 57, Nero 6, Vitell. 3, Vesp. 25, Tit. 9.

⁹ With the prodigy compare Sueton. Aug. 94: 'infans adhuc, ut scriptum apud C. Drusum extat, repositus vespere in cunas a nutricula loco plano, postera luce non comparuit, diuque quaesitus tandem in altissima turri repertus est, iacens contra solis exortum.'

¹⁰ Accessit aliud praesagium, siquidem. Suetonius, Vitellius, 9: 'laetum evenit auspiciis, siquidem.' This use of *siquidem* is common in silver age Latin.

For the prodigy of the poplar compare Suetonius, Augustus, 94: 'apud Mundam Divus Iulius, castris locum capiens cum silvam caederet, arborem palmae

brevi evaluit ut multo ante satas populos adaequaret, quae arbor Vergilii ex eo dicta atque etiam consecrata est summa gravidarum ac fetarum religione¹ et suscipientium ibi et solventium vota. 6. Initia aetatis Cremonae² egit usque ad virilem togam, quam XV anno natali suo accepit isdem illis consulibus iterum quibus erat natus, evenitque ut eo ipso die Lucretius poeta decederet. 7. Sed Vergilius a Cremona Mediolanum et inde paulo post transiit in urbem.

8. Corpore et statura fuit grandi³, aquilo colore, facie rusticana, valetudine varia; nam plerumque a stomacho et a faucibus ac dolore capitis laborabat⁴, sanguinem etiam saepius reiecit⁵. 9. Cibi vinique minimi⁶, libidinis⁷ in pueros pronior, quorum

ut *G.* ita brevi evaluit *P.* ita brevi evaluit tempore *B.* ita brevi coaluit *Can. C.* adaequarle *C.* adaequavisset *codd. cet.* [et] suscipientium *G.* et *om. Can. C.* 6. XVII *B.* XV *Reifferscheid.* coepit *G. Can.* consulibus iterum [duobus] *G.* consulibus iterum *Can. C.* eodem ipso die *G. Can. C.* 7. [Sed Vergilius a] *Reifferscheid.* 8. grandi *G. Can. C.* grandis *B. P.* aquilo *G.* aquili *B. P.* aquilino *Can.* aquilio *C.* ob stomacho *G.* ab stomacho *Can. C.* et faucibus *Can. C.* saepius reiecit *G.* saepius eiecit *B. 527, Can. C.* saepe reiecit *Reifferscheid, Hagen.* 9. promoris *G.*

reptam conservari ut omen victoriae iussit; ex ea continuo enata suboles adeo in paucis diebus adolevit ut non aequiperaret modo matricem, verum et obtegeret frequentareturque columbarum nidis,' &c. *Vespas. 5*: 'in suburbano Flaviorum quercus antiqua, quae erat Marti sacra, per tres Vespasiae partus singulos repente ramos a frutice dedit;' *ib.* 'arbor quoque cupressus in agro avito sine ulla vi tempestatis evulsa radicitus atque prostrata, insequenti die viridior ac firmior resurrexit.' *Livy, 43. 13. 5*, mentions as a prodigy 'palmam in area enatam.' See *Plin. 16. 132*; *17. 243*: 'C. Epidi commentarii in quibus arbores locutae quoque reperiuntur;' hence perhaps *Schol. Bern. Ecl. 1. 17*: 'in templo Iovis Dodonaei quercus fuerunt dedicatae quae fata Romanorum cecinerunt.'

¹ *summa gravidarum ac fetarum religione*: compare the supposed effects of the contact of a fruitful bough, *Iuv. 2. 142*, and the scholion as emended by Haupt: 'quia fructum multi seminis credi[tur conducere] contactu ad fecunditatem dandum.'

² *Cremonae*: was his mother, a Magia, a native of Cremona? *Caesar, B. C. 1. 24. 4*, mentions a Numerius Magius Cremona.

³ Compare Suetonius, *Iulius, 45*: 'fuisse traditur excelsa statura, colore candido . . . valetudine prospera;' *Aug. 79*, where note the expression 'colorem inter aquilum candidumque;' *Tiberius, 68*: 'corpore fuit amplo atque robusto, statura quae iustam excederet . . . colore erat candido . . . facie honesta . . . valetudine prosperrima usus est;' *Calig. 50*; *Claud. 30*; *Nero, 51*; and the other lives by Suetonius. *Aquilus* seems to mean dark, *candidus* fair.

⁴ *a stomacho &c. laborare*, a common use of *a*: see *Dictt. Sueton. Tib. 68*: 'latus ab humeris et pectore.'

⁵ *sanguinem reiecit*: either *reicere* or *ei cere* may be used in this sense. *Gronovius* quotes *Plin. Epist. 5. 19*: 'sanguinem reiecit.'

⁶ Sueton. *Aug. 76*: 'cibi minimi erat vulgaris fere;' *Claud. 33*: 'cibi vinique . . . appetentissimus;' *Galba, 22*: 'cibi plurimi traditur.'

⁷ *libidinis &c.*: Sueton. *Galba, 22*: 'libidinis in mares pronior.' Compare also

maxime dilexit Cebetem et Alexandrum, quem secunda Bucolicorum ecloga Alexim appellat, donatum sibi ab Asinio Pollione, utrumque non ineruditum, Cebetem vero et poetam. 10. Vulgatum est consuesse¹ eum et cum Plotia Hieria. Sed Asconius Pedianus adfirmat ipsam postea narrare solitam invitatum quidem a Vario ad communionem sui, verum pertinacissime recusasse². 11. Cetera sane vita et ore et animo tam probum³ constat⁴ ut Neapoli Parthenias⁵ vulgo appellatus sit, ac si quando Romae, quo rarissime commeabat, viseretur in publico, sectantes⁶ demonstrantesque se subterfugeret in proximum tectum. 12. Bona autem cuiusdam exulantis offerente Augusto non sustinuit⁷ accipere. 13. Possedit⁸ prope centiens sesterium ex liberalitatibus⁹ amicorum, habuitque domum Romae

pronior . . . his *B. P.* pronioris *Can. C. Hagen.* Vide quae ex Suetonio exempla collegi. quorum maxime; verum inter eos maxime *Can. C.* non ineruditum, nam Alexandrum *B 527.* non ineruditum, nam Alexandrum grammaticum *Can. C.* 10. consuesse *G.* consuevisse *Can. C.* Hieria *G. Can. C.* ieria *P.* geria, corr. ieria *B.* Leria *Servius ecl. ii. 15.* Galeria *Ribbeck.* Varo *B 527.* *Can. C.* verum: sed *B 527.* sed pertinacissime abstinuisset *Can. C.* 11. vita *G. Can.* vitae *Reifferscheid, Hagen.* ore probum: more *Ribbeck.* tam probatum coni. *Hagen.* sed cf. *Sallustius apud Sueton. de claris Grammaticis iam a Gronovio laudatus:* oris probi, animo inverecundo; *Sueton. Dom. 18,* commendari se verecundia oris; *Plin. Paneg. 4,* dignitas oris; 24, oris humanitas; 48, in ore impudentia; *Fronto ad Marc. Aur. Epist. 4. 12 fin.,* tuum os probum ac facetum. Probum fuisse constat, *Can.* probum constat *G.* proba, corr. probum *B.* subter fugere in proximum tectum *G. Can. C.* (improximum *C.*) subterfugeret *Hagen.* suffugere *B. P.* suffugeret *Reifferscheid.*

Iul. 50: 'pronus et sumptuosus in libidines;' Claud. 33: 'libidinis in feminas profundissimae;' Tib. 44: 'pronior ad id genus libidinis.' From these instances it would seem that *pronus* is used of the person, not of the feeling.

¹ *consuesse:* see Dictt. for this use. *Hieria:* 'Hieriam Maecenatis ancillam' Schol. Bern. Ecl. 6. 17 (*Ribbeck*). *Servius* on Ecl. 2. 15: 'tres dicitur Vergilius . . . amasse, Alexandrum, quem donavit ei Pollio, et Cebetem puerum cum Leria (=ieria) puella, quos a Maecenate dicitur accepisse.'

² *perstinacissime recusasse:* *Gronovius* quotes *Sueton. Tib. 45:* 'et quicquam amplius pati constantissime recusantem.'

³ *ore . . . probum:* modest in expression as well as in mind; see critical note.

⁴ *probum constat:* for the syntax compare *Suet. Galba 22:* 'cibi plurimi traditur.'

⁵ *Parthenias:* no doubt a pun on his name, as *Heyne* saw.

⁶ *sectantes, &c.* Compare *Horace's* 'Monstrari digito praetereuntium;' *Persius's* 'at suaves digito monstrari et dicier Hic est.'

⁷ *non sustinuit:* *Suetonius, Iul. 74:* 'Cornelio Phagitae . . . numquam nocere sustinuit.' *Gronovius* also quotes *Titus, 9:* 'nec occidere nec seponere sustinuit.'

⁸ *Suet. Fragn. Roth, p. 290:* 'possedit bis miliens sesterium.' *Probus* says, 'ab Augusto usque ad sesterium centiens honestatus est.'

⁹ *Liberalitates* in the sense of presents; *Sueton. Claud. 29, Galba, 15.*

Esquiliis iuxta hortos Maecenatianos¹, quamquam secessu Campaniae² Siciliaeque plurimum uteretur. 14. Parentes³ iam grandis amisit, ex quibus patrem captum oculis, et duos fratres germanos, Silonem inpuerem, Flaccum iam adultum, cuius exitum⁴ sub nomine Daphnidis deflet.

15. Inter cetera studia medicinae quoque et maxime mathematicae operam dedit⁵. Egit et causam apud iudices unam omnino, nec amplius quam semel⁶; 16. nam et in sermone tardissimum ac paene indocto similem fuisse Melissus tradidit. 17. Poeticam puer adhuc auspicatus⁷ in Ballistam ludi⁸ magistrum ob infamiam latrociniorum coopertum lapidibus distichon fecit

Monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus;

Nocte, die, tutum carpe, viator, iter⁹.

13. aesquiliis *G. Can.* ortos *B 527, Can.* mecenatianos *G. B. 527, Can.*; cf. *Suet. Tib. 15.* mecenatis *B. P.* 14. [iam] adultum *G.* iam adultum *Can. adultum C.* 15. studia ut superius dixi *B 527, Can. C.* apud iudices *om. Can. C.* 16. nam et in *om. Can. C.* indocto *G. Can.* indoctum *B.* similem eum fuisse *Hagen.* 17. adhuc puer *Can. C.* ludi magistrum *Can. C.* ludi [gladiatorii] magistrum *B 527.* catalecton *libri*: vid. p. 34.

¹ hortos *Maecenatianos*: Sueton. Tib. 15: 'Esquilias in hortos Maecenatianos transmigravit.'

² *secessu Campaniae*: Sueton. Tib. 43: 'secessu Capreensi'; Aug. 94: 'secessus Apolloniae'; 98: 'secessui Caprearum'; Cal. 29: 'secessus Anticyrae.'

³ Suetonius, Aug. 8: 'quadrimus patrem amisit'; Nero, 6: 'trimulus patrem amisit'; Iul. 1: 'annum agens XVI patrem amisit.'

⁴ *cuius exitum*, &c. See Essay, p. 39.

Ribbeck quotes from the Berne scholia on Ecl. 5. 22, 'superstite enim Maia matre Flaccus defunctus est, quae eius mortem graviter ferens non diu supervixit.' *Supervixit*, it may be observed, is used by Suetonius, Iul. 89: 'percursorum autem neque triennio quisquam supervixit:' the Dictt. quote instances from the younger Pliny, Justin, and Florus.

The Berne scholion on Ecl. 5. 1. 22: 'obitum fratris deflet, fratrem suum, nomine Flaccum, deflet, sub cuius nomine vel Flaccum germanum suum vel Iulium deflet,' is clearly borrowed from Suetonius.

⁵ *mathematicae*, astrology.

⁶ *Egit et causam . . . nec amplius quam semel*: does this mean that he only spoke in one case, and that only in one *actio*?

For the language, comp. Sueton. Claud. 17: 'expeditionem unam omnino suscepit, eamque modicam.'

⁷ *auspicari*, to begin: Sueton. Claud. 7: 'honores auspicatus'; Nero, 7: 'auspicatus est et iurisdictionem'; 22: 'cantare auspicatus'; Plin. Paneg. 1: 'nihil rite . . . sine deorum immortalium ope . . . auspicarentur'; Columella 1. 5. 9: 'sed quisquis aedificia volet in declivibus areis extruere, semper ab inferiore parte auspicetur.'

⁸ *ludi*, i.e. a school of gladiators.

⁹ *Nocte die*, &c.: imitated by Ov. Nux 43-4: 'Sic timet insidias, qui scit se

Deinde [catalepton¹ et priapia et epigrammata et diras, item cirim et] culicem cum esset annorum XVI. 18. Cuius materia talis est. Pastor fatigatus aestu cum sub arbore condormisset² et serpens ad eum proreperet e palude, culex praevolavit atque inter duo tempora aculeum fixit pastori. At ille continuo culicem contrivit et serpentem interemit ac sepulcrum culici statuit et distichon fecit;

Parve culex³, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti

Funeris officium vitae pro munere reddit.

19. Scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur Aetnam. Mox cum res Romanas incohasset, offensus materia ad Bucolica transiit maxime ut Asinium Pollionem⁴ Alfenum Varum et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum qui post Philipensem victoriam veteranis dividebantur indemnem se praestitissent. 20. Deinde [edidit] Georgica in honorem Maecenatis⁵, qui sibi mediocriter adhuc noto opem tulisset adversus veterani cuiusdam violentiam⁶, a quo in altercatione litis agrariae paulum afuit quin occideretur. 21. Novissime Aeneidem inco-

deinde moretum et priapeiam et epigrammata et diras et culicem *Can. C. omissis catalepton et cirim.* Unde suspicor Suetonium scripsisse *deinde culicem.* XV *Can. XX. C.* et item cirim *G.* [et] item cirimus *B. P.* 18. condormisset *B. P.* obdormisset *G.* obdormisset *Can. C.* condormiebat *Suet. Aug. 78.* ad eum *B. P.* ad illum *G. Can.* praevolavit *G. Can. C.* provolavit *B. P.* contrivit *G. Can. C.* attrivit *B.* adtrivit *P.* culici *G. Can.* culicis *B. P.* 19. de qua ambigitur *uncis inclusit Hagen.* scripsit etnam *G.* aethnam de qua ambigitur *B.* de qua ambigitur aetnam *Vulg. Can.* et mox *C.* quom *Can.* incohasset *Can.* incoasset *C.* materia ad *B. G. Can. C.* materia et nominum asperitate *Vulg.* Alphenumque *G. Hagen.* Alphenum *B. P. Can. Reifferscheid.* 20. edidit *om. libri, post deinde inseruit Hagen.*

in honorem *P.* in honorem *Reifferscheid.* in honore *G. Hagen.* honori *B 527, Can. C.* vixdum noto *B 527, Can. C.* litis agrariae *G. Can.* agrarii ac *C.* litis *B. P.* abfuit *Can. C.* 21. incohavit; aggressus est

ferre viator, Quod timeat: tutum carpit inanis iter:’ see Mayor on Iuv. 10. 22, second edition.

¹ *catalepton*: Essay, p. 34: *culicem, ib.* p. 38.

² *condormisset*: see critical note.

³ *Parve culex, &c.*: these lines conclude the poem which bears the name of *Culex*.

⁴ *Asinium Pollionem, &c.* Probus: ‘postea restitutus beneficio Alfeni Vari, Asinii Pollionis, et Cornelii Galli, quibus in Bucolicis adulatur:’ see Essay, p. 40 foll.

⁵ Maecenas introduced him to Augustus according to Probus: ‘deinde per gratiam Maecenatis in amicitiam Caesaris ductus est.’

For *deinde* followed by *novissime* comp. Suet. De Gramm. 6: ‘philosophiam primo, deinde rhetoricam, novissime grammaticam.’

⁶ *violentiam*: Focas: ‘Iam Maro pulsus erat, sed viribus obvius ibat Fretus amicorum clipeo, cum paene nefando Ense perit.’ Vergil may have met force by force, and had an affray similar to that described by Cicero pro Caecina.

havit, argumentum varium ac multiplex et quasi amborum Homeri carminum instar¹, praeterea nominibus ac rebus² Graecis Latinisque commune et in quo³, quod maxime studebat, Romanae simul urbis et Augusti origo contineretur.

22. Cum Georgica scriberet, traditur cotidie meditados⁴ mane plurimos versus dictare solitus, ac per totum diem retractando ad paucissimos redigere⁵, non absurde⁶ carmen se ursae more⁷ parere dicens et lambendo demum effingere. 23. Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam⁸ digestamque in XII libros particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens. 24. Ac ne quid impetum moraretur, quaedam imperfecta transmisit, alia levissimis versibus veluti fulsit, quos

Can. C. cf. *Probus, Vita Vergilii*, Aeneida ingressus bello Cantabrico. carminum *G. Can.* carmini *B.*, corr. carminis. carminis *P.* 22. meditatus *Hagen.* meditados *libri, Reifferscheid.* carmen se more: carmen se informe more *Reifferscheid.* more ursae: ursae more *G. Can. C.* more ursae *B. P.* 23. firmatam *Hagen.* formare autem *Suetonianum est: Aug. 89: 'si quid res exigeret Latine formabat vertendumque alii dedit;'* Nero, 47: 'inventus est postea in scrinio eius ac de re sermo formatus.' bis sena volumina sacro Formavit donata duci trieteride quarta *Foas.* arripiens *G.* accipiens, corr. arripiens *B.* 24. ac ne quid *G. Hagen.* ut ne quid *B. P. Reifferscheid.* levissimis versibus *G. B 527, Can. C.* verbis *B. P. Reifferscheid.* scripsit *B 527 Can. C.* quos *G. B 527, Can. C.* quae *B. P.* tigillis *Can. C.* tigillis [vel tibicinibus] *B 527.* tibicinibus *G. P.* tibianibus *B.* a se dicebat *G. Can.* aiebat

¹ *instar*: Suet. Vesp. 5: 'tertium vero instar arboris' (as large as a tree).

² *nominibus ac rebus*, &c.: the hostile critic in Macrobius says, 'vel si mille alia multum pudenda seu in verbis modo Graecis modo barbaris seu in ipsa dispositione operis deprehenduntur.'

³ *in quo*, &c. Compare Propertius, quoted in Essay, p. 66, 'Caesaris in magnos condere nomen avos.'

Servius on Aen. i. 1, doubtless from Suetonius or the same sources: 'intentio Vergilii haec est, Homerum imitari, et Augustum laudare a parentibus.'

⁴ *meditados*: the passive use of this participle is found in Cicero; with this passage compare Suetonius, Aug. 84, 'meditata et composita oratione.'

⁵ *ad paucissimos redigere*: this is probably from the memoir by Varius: Quint. 10. 3. 8: 'Vergilium quoque paucissimos die composuisse versus auctor est Varius.'

⁶ *non absurde*, not badly: Suetonius, De Gramm. 6: 'ex quibus novem unus corporis . . . non absurde et fecisse et scripsisse se ait;' Dom. 3: 'non absurde responsum sit;' and not unfrequently in the Latin of the silver age.

⁷ *ursae more*: again very probably from Varius: Gell. 17. 10: 'amici familiaresque P. Vergilii in eis quae de ingenio moribusque eius memoriae tradiderunt, dicere eum solitum ferunt, parere se versus more atque ritu ursino. Nam ut illa bestia fetum ederet ineffigiatum informemque, lambendo id postea quod ita edidisset conformaret et fingeret, proinde ingenii quoque sui partus recentes rudi esse facie et imperfecta, sed deinceps tractando colendoque reddere se oris et vultus lineamenta.' Comp. Vergil's 'corpora fingere lingua' (A. 8. 634).

⁸ *formatam*, drafted, put roughly into shape: see the passages quoted in the critical note, which shew that the word was used of the preliminary drafting of a work for subsequent use or alteration. So the critic in Macrobius, 5. 17. 4, says,

per iocum pro tibicinibus interponi aiebat ad sustinendum opus, donec solidae columnae advenirent.

25. Bucolica triennio¹, Georgica VII, Aeneida XI perfecit annis. 26. Bucolica eo successu edidit, ut in scaena quoque per cantores² crebro pronuntiarentur³.

27. Georgica reverso post Actiacam victoriam Augusto atque Atellae reficiendarum faucium⁴ causa commoranti per continuum quadriduum⁵ legit, suscipiente Maecenate legendi vicem, quotiens interPELLARETUR ipse vocis offensione. 28⁶. Pronuntiabat autem cum suavitate tum lenociniis miris. 29⁷. Seneca tradidit Iulium Montanum poetam solitum dicere involaturum se Vergilio quaedam si et vocem posset et os⁸ et hypocrisin; eosdem enim versus ipso pronuntiante⁹ bene sonare, sine illo inanes esse

B. P. 25. biennio *G. C.* ^{tri}biennio *Can.* confecit *Can. C.* perficit *G.* hoc carmine consul Pollio laudatur ter se revocantibus annis composito *Focas.* 26. crebra pronuntiarentur *G. B 527, Can. C.* crebra pronuntiatione recitarentur *Vulg.* 27. post Actiacam victoriam *B.* per *G.* ab Actiaca victoria *Can. C.* fortasse recte faucium *B. P.* virium *G. B 527, Can. C.* reficiendarum virium causa . . . faucium offensione *cont. Hagen.* 28. cum suavitate lenociniis *G.* cum suavitate lenociniis *Can. C.* cum suavitate [et] lenociniis *B 527.* cum suavitate cum lenociniis *B. P.* cum . . . tum *Reifferscheid.* 29. Ac Seneca *Hagen.* et Seneca *G. B. P.* Seneca *Can. C.* inanes esse *mutesque*: inanescere quasi mutos *B 527, Can. C.* eo pronuntiante

'librum Aeneidos suae quartum totum paene (de Argonauticorum quarto) formaverit:' i.e. Vergil took the main idea and outline of the work from Apollonius.

For the order in which the books of the Aeneid may have been composed, see Essay, p. 65 foll.

¹ *triennio*: see critical note, and note on the Life by Servius, and Essay, p. 48.

² *cantores*, reciters of verses: compare Horace's 'Omnibus hoc vitium est cantoribus: nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.' (I S. 3. 1, 10. 19.)

³ To these recitations of the Eclogues Ribbeck refers the words of Tacitus, Dial. 13: 'testis ipse populus, qui auditis in theatro Vergilii versibus surrexit universus, et forte praesentem spectantemque Vergilium veneratus est sic quasi Augustum.'

⁴ *reficiendarum faucium*: his throat seems to have been weak, if we may trust Suetonius, Aug. 84: 'nonnunquam infirmatis faucibus praeconis voce ad populum confectionatus est.'

⁵ *per continuum quadriduum*: comp. Columella, 2. 4. 5: 'continuo triennio.'

⁶ Compare Suetonius, Aug. 84: 'pronuntiabat dulci et proprio quodam oris sono;' Iul. 55: 'pronuntiasset autem dicitur voce acuta, ardenti motu gestuque, non sine venustate.'

⁷ This story is not found in the extant works of either Seneca: but the rhetorician Seneca has another anecdote about 'Montanus Iulius qui comis fuit quique egregius poeta;' Controv. 7. 27. For Iulius Montanus see Teuffel, R. L. § 247. 13. Ov. Pont. 4. 16. 11: 'quique vel imparibus numeris, Montane, vel aequis Sufficis.'

⁸ *os*, utterance, management of the voice, pronunciation: Quint. I. 1. 37: 'quo sit absolutius os et expressior sermo;' 11. 3. 30: 'promptum sit os, non praeceps, moderatum, non lentum.'

⁹ *pronuntiante*, reading or reciting.

mutosque¹. 30². Aeneidos vixdum coeptae tanta extitit fama ut Sextus Propertius non dubitaverit sic praedicare;

Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite, Grai;

Nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade.

31. Augustus vero, nam forte expeditione Cantabrica aberat, supplicibus atque etiam minacibus³ per iocum litteris efflagitabat ut sibi 'de Aeneide' ut ipsius verba sunt 'vel prima carminis ὑπογραφή vel quodlibet colon mitteretur.' Cui tamen multo post perfectaue demum materia tres omnino libros recitavit, secundum quartum et sextum; 32. sed hunc notabili Octaviae adfectione⁴, quae cum recitationi interesset, ad illos de filia sua versus 'Tu Marcellus eris' defecisse fertur atque aegre focilata⁵ est. 33⁶. Recitavit et pluribus, sed neque frequenter et ea fere de quibus ambigebat, quo magis iudicium hominum experiretur. 34. Erotem librarium eius exactae iam senectutis⁷ tradunt referre solitum⁸, quondam eum in recitando duos dimidiatos versus compluisse ex tempore. Nam cum hactenus haberet 'Misenum Aeoliden,' adiecisse 'quo non praestantior alter,' item huic 'Aere ciere viros' simili calore iactatum subiunxisse

Can. C. 30. grai Can. C. 31. cum iam forte Can. C. mitteretur. Cui: mitteretur G. mitteretur. negavit [se facturum Vergilius] cui B 527. mitteret. negavit. cui Can. mitteret Reifferscheid. et sextum G. B 527. Can. C. et om. B. P. 33. et ferme illa Can. C. 34. dimidios C. iactatum B. G. P. Can. elatum Reifferscheid. adscriberet G. Can.

¹ *inanes esse*, &c.; see critical note: *inanesco* is quoted in the Dictt. from Am-
 manianus and Augustine.

² See Essay, p. 66.

³ *supplicibus atque etiam minacibus*: Suetonius, Titus, 5: 'suppliciter nec non
 et minaciter efflagitantes, aut remaneret aut secum omnes abduceret.'

This correspondence was extant, we must suppose, in the time of Tacitus: Dial.
 13: 'testes Augusti litterae.' For Vergil's answer see Essay, p. 64.

⁴ *adfectione*: Tac. A. 4. 15: 'laetas inter audientium adfectiones.'

⁵ *aegre focilatus* Plin. Epist. 3. 14. 4; Gronovius quotes Sueton. Aug. 17: 'M.
 Antoni societatem semper dubiam et incertam reconciliationibusque variis male
 focilatam.'

⁶ Horace was more fastidious: 'nec recito cuivis nisi amicis, idque coactus'
 S. I. 4. 73. Vergil laid himself open to hostile as well as friendly criticism.

⁷ *exactae senectutis*: Gronov. quotes Suet. De Grammaticis, 17: 'decessit aetatis
 exactae sub Tiberio.'

This story sounds apocryphal: yet for the last sentence compare Horace, S. I. 10.
 92: 'I puer atque meo citus haec subscribe libello.'

⁸ *tradunt referre solitum*: for the construction compare Sueton. Iul. 83:
 'Quintus Tubero tradit heredem ab eo scribi solitum . . . Cn. Pompeium.'

‘Martemque accendere cantu,’ statimque sibi imperasse ut utrumque volumini adscriberet. 35. Anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo impositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere, triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare, ut reliqua vita tantum philosophiae vacaret¹. Sed cum ingressus iter Athenis occurrisset Augusto ab Oriente Romam revertenti, destinaretque non absistere atque etiam una redire, dum Megara vicinum oppidum ferventissimo sole cognoscit², languorem nactus³ est eumque non intermissa navigatione auxit ita ut gravior⁴ aliquando Brundisium appelleret, ubi diebus paucis obiit XI Kal. Oct. C. Sentio Q. Lucretio consulibus.

36. Ossa eius Neapolim translata sunt tumuloque condita qui est via Puteolana intra lapidem secundum, in quo distichon fecit tale

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc

Parthenope, cecini pascua, rura, duces⁵.

37. Heredes fecit ex dimidia parte Valerium Proculum fratrem alio patre⁶, ex quarta Augustum, ex duodecima Maecenatem, ex reliqua L. Varium et Plotium Tuccam, qui eius Aeneida post

ascriberet *B.* 35. summam *G.* summa *B. P.* ultimam *Vulg. Can. gravior*: aegrior *Hagen.* gravior *codd. Reifferscheid.* ut gravior tandem Brundisium adventarit *Can. C.* Nec abhorret gravior a Latino sermone: *Lucret. 3. 1066*: ‘abit in somnum gravis;’ *Val. Flacc. 6. 65*: ‘gravior de vulnere;’ *Fronto Epp. ad Marc. Aur. 5. 8. 23*: ‘mater iam levior est, dis volentibus.’ *XI Kal. : X Kal. Can. C.* C. Sentius fasti consulares. Cn. Sentio *G. Can. C.* Sencio *G. B 527.* Festio *B.* Plantio *Vulg.* 37. ex dimidia parte *G.* ex dimidiam partem (*corr. m. 2*) *B.* ex alio patre *G. Can. C.* alio patre *B. Reifferscheid. Hagen.* L. Varium *G.* Varum *Can.* Valerium *B.* Aeneidem *G. Can.*

¹ ut . . . philosophiae vacaret: compare the end of the second Georgic. So Propertius, 4. 5. 25 foll., says of his old age, ‘Tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores &c.’ See Essay, p. 37.

² cognoscit: Propertius, 1. 6. 13: ‘an mihi sit tanti doctas cognoscere Athenas;’ Suet. Cal. 3: ‘sicubi clarorum virorum sepulcra cognosceret;’ Aug. 53: ‘inuitatum dignumque cognitu;’ and other instances in the Dictt.

³ nactus: Gronov. quotes Sueton. Titus, 10: ‘febrim nactus;’ the Dictt. give also Nepos, Atticus, 21. 2: ‘morbum nactus.’

⁴ gravior: see critical note.

⁵ Probus, Life: ‘in cuius sepulcro quod est in via Puteolana hoc legitur epigramma, Mantua e. q. s.’

⁶ alio patre: his father then must have died first and his mother have married again. Compare Probus, Life: ‘decessit in Calabria annum agens quinquagesimum et primum heredibus Augusto et Maecenate cum Proculo minore fratre.’

obitum iussu Caesaris emendaverunt. 38. De qua re Sulpicii¹ Karthaginiensis extant huiusmodi versus

Iusserat haec rapidis aboleri carmina flammis

Vergilius, Phrygium quae cecinere ducem;

Tucca vetat Variusque, simul tu, maxime Caesar

Non sinis² et Latiae consulis historiae.

Infelix³ gemino cecidit prope Pergamon igni,

Et paene est alio Troia cremata rogo⁴.

39. Egerat cum Vario priusquam Italia decederet ut si quid sibi accidisset Aeneida combureret; at is facturum se pernegarat. Igitur in extrema valetudine assidue scrinia desideravit crematurus ipse; verum nemine offerente nihil quidem nominatim de ea cavito⁵, 40. ceterum eidem Vario ac simul Tuccae⁶ scripta sua sub ea condicione legavit ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset. 41. Edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam imperfectos sicuti erant reliquerit; quos multi mox supplere conati non perinde⁷ valuerunt ob difficultatem, quod omnia fere apud eum hemistichia absoluto perfectoque sunt sensu praeter illud 'quem tibi⁸ iam Troia.'

aeneidam B. P. 38. *aboleri*: adoleri? Gell. xvii. 10. 7: 'petivit . . . ut Aeneida quam non satis elimavisset adolerent. *Non sinis et*: non tibi sed *Probi quae fertur vita Vergilii*. Pergamos *Can. C.* *cremata*: cremata sepulta *G. cremata Can. C.* sepulta *Hagen*. 39. *at is*: et is *libri*. at *Hagen*. sed *Reifferscheid*. is facturum *libri*. is ita facturum *Hagen*. assiduus *G.* 41. praeter illud quem tibi iam Troia sensum videantur habere perfectum *G.*: sic

¹ *Sulpicii*: Sulpicius Apollinaris, the master of Aulus Gellius: Teuffel, Röm. Litt. § 353. 2.

² *non sinis*: this surely and not *non tibi* (see critical note) must be the right reading. *Latiae consulis historiae* is taken from Propertius, 4. 4 (3). 10: 'ite et Romanae consulite historiae.'

³ *Infelix*. &c.: these two lines are not quoted in the Life by Probus, in which indeed the whole poem has no place, being confessedly taken from Servius; who probably in his turn took it from Suetonius.

⁴ *sepulta rogo*, the reading adopted by Hagen, is surely a strange expression: although it is true that *sepelire* has a far more general meaning than *humare*.

⁵ Probus, Life: 'Aeneis servata ab Augusto quamvis ipse testamento damnaverat, ne quid eorum quod non edidisset extaret.' The hostile critic in Macrobius, 1. 24. 6, takes Vergil at his own estimate: 'qui enim moriens poema suum legavit igni . . . erubuit quippe de se futura iudicia, &c.'

⁶ Vergil's three great friends were Quintilius Varus, Varius, and Tucca. Probus, Life: 'insigni concordia et familiaritate usus Quintili, Tuccae, et Vari.' Quintili is the Quintilius of Horace: 'Tu frustra pius heu non ita creditum Poscis Quintilium deos: Quintilio si quid recitares.'

⁷ *non perinde*: see Essay, p. 30.

⁸ *quem tibi*: this reading, confirmed as it is by the reading of the best MSS.

42. Nisus¹ grammaticus audisse se a senioribus aiebat Varium duorum librorum ordinem commutasse, et qui tunc secundus erat² in tertium locum transtulisse, etiam primi libri correxisse principium his versibus demptis

³ Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
Carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
Ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,
Gratum opus agricolis; at nunc horrentia Martis
Arma virumque cano.

43. Obtrectatores Vergilio numquam defuerunt, nec mirum, nam ne Homero quidem. Prolatis⁴ Bucolicis Numitorius quidam rescripsit Antibucolica, duas modo eclogas sed insulsiissime *παρῳδήσας*, quarum prioris initium est

Tityre, si toga calda tibi est, quo tegmine fagi?
sequentis Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? anne Latinum?

Non. Verum Aegonis nostri sic rure loquuntur.

Alius recitante eo ex Georgicis

Nudus ara, sere nudus,
subiecit

habebis frigore febrim⁵.

Can. C., nisi quod videbatur pro videantur habent. quem tibi iam Troia peperit sensum videntur habere perfectum *Vulg.*

42. Nisi *G.* Nisius *B* 527, *Can. C.* qui tunc secundus erat in tertium locum *B* 527, *Can. C.* qui nunc secundus sit *B. G.* qui nunc secundus sit in primum, tertium in secundum et primum in tertium *Reifferscheid.* qui tunc secundus esset in tertium *Hagen.* 43. nec Homero *codd.* ne Homero *Gronovius.* Numitorius *Hagen, Ribbeck, Woelflin* numipatoris *B.* numinatoris *P.* Prolatis Bucolicis . . . quidam *G* parodesas *G.* *παρῳδήσας B. P.* paro quidam *Vulg. Can. C.* Non. Verum, &c.:

of Vergil, proves conclusively that the sentence was left unfinished, and that the attempt to emend it by writing *quae* from inferior copies is a mistake.

¹ *Nisus*: a scholar of the age of Tiberius, quoted later by Charisius, Velius Longus, Macrobius, and others: Teuffel, R. L. § 277. 4.

² *qui tunc secundus erat*, &c. I follow the reading of *B* 527 and *Can.*, and understand the words to mean that Varius found the third Aeneid in Vergil's manuscript placed, accidentally or otherwise, before the second: that it was written before the second there seems to be no doubt; see Essay, p. 64. Hagen thinks the words refer to the prose draft of the Aeneid. But the whole story may be apocryphal.

³ *Ille ego*, &c.: I am surprised that Henry in his posthumous 'Aeneidea' defends the genuineness of these lines, although the Aeneid read by Ovid must have begun with 'arma virumque cano'; see Conington on Aen. i. 1. The *scholia* attributed to Servius are inconsistent on this point: for in the preface (fn.) the words 'arma virumque cano' are quoted as the beginning of the Aeneid, while on Aen. i. 1 the commentator states that Vergil did not begin with 'arna.'

⁴ *Prolatis*: Cic. Att. 15. 13 a. 1: 'eius (orationis) proferendae arbitrium tuum.'

⁵ Servius on Ecl. 2. 23 quotes a similar criticism on the line 'lac mihi non aestate

44. Est et adversus Aeneida liber Carvili Pictoris titulo Aeneidomastix. M. Vipsanius¹ a Maecenate² eum suppositum appellabat novae cacozeliae repertorem, non tumidae nec exilis, sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis. Herennius tantum vitia eius, Perellius Faustus furta contraxit. 45. Sed et Q. Octavi Aviti *ῥμοιοτήτων*³ octo volumina quos et unde versus transtulerint continent. 46⁴. Asconius Pedianus libro quem contra obtrectatores Vergilii scripsit pauca admodum obiecta ei proponit eaque circa historiam fere et quod pleraque ab Homero sumpsisset; sed hoc ipsum crimen sic defendere adsuetum ait

interpunctio Gronovii est, 'Sed Aegonis nostri rure, hoc est in Virgili Bucolicis, ita loquuntur.'

44. Carbili *B. P.* Carbilli *Can.* Cabili *G.* suppositum *κακοτελή* appellat repertoremque *B 527, Can.* repertore *G. Hagen.* repertorem *B. P. Reifferscheid.* Faustinus *G. Can.* 45. *ῥμοιοτήτων Hagen.* *ῥμοιοτελεύτων G.* homoeotheleuton *B. P.* *ῥμοίων ἐλέγχων Reifferscheid.* Sunt Q. Octavi Habiti volumina quos et unde versus transtulerit *Can. C.* sed et quinti octavi aviti *G.* sed et quae octaviani (*m. 2* qui octavi aviti) *B.* 46. pleraque ab Homero sumpserit *B 527, Can. C.* recedere *Reginensis, Reifferscheid.* decederet *B. P.:* decideret *G. Can.*

novum non frigore defit,' the sense of which the critic changed by punctuating after 'frigore.'

¹ *M. Vipsanius*: there seems no reason to doubt that this is M. Vipsanius Agrippa.

² *a Maecenate, &c.*: that he was suborned by Maecenas to invent a new kind of affectation in style. Suetonius, Aug. 86: 'cacozeles et antiquarios ut diverso genere vitiosos pari fastidio sprexit exagitabatque nonnumquam, in primis Maecenatem suum;' for an explanation of *κακοζηλία*, see Quint. 8. 3. 56: '*κακοζήλον*, id est mala adfectatio, per omne dicendi genus peccat: nam et tumida et pusilla, et praedulcia et abundantia et arcessita et exultantia sub idem nomen cadunt. Denique cacozeleon vocatur quidquid est ultra virtutem, quotiens ingenium iudicio caret et specie boni fallitur, omnium in eloquentia vitorum pessimum.'

³ *ῥμοιοτήτων*: Hagen refers to Athenaeus 15, p. 690 E, iv. p. 170 E, where *ῥμοιότητες* means equivalent expressions, as *structor* for *τραπεζοκόμος*: if Hagen's conjecture be adopted, the word here should mean *translations*.

⁴ I suppose this to mean that Asconius in his reply to the *obtrectatores* sets forth only a few of the hostile criticisms made against Vergil, and that those which he does mention concern only Vergil's management of his story. The hostile critic in Macrobius, 1. 24. 6, speaks of 'multa pudenda in dispositione operis.' An answer to objections of this kind is given by Servius (p. 4, Thilo): 'Ordo quoque manifestus est, licet quidam superflue dicant primum esse, tertium secundum, et primum tertium, ideo quia primo Ilium concidit, post erravit Aeneas, inde ad Didonis regna pervenit; nescientes hanc esse artem poeticam, ut a mediis incipientes per narrationem prima reddamus, et nonnumquam futura praecoccupemus ut per vaticinationem.' Comp. Macrobius, 5. 14. 9: 'ille enim vitans in poemate historicorum similitudinem, quibus lex est incipere ab initio rerum et continuum narrationem usque ad finem perducere, ipse poetica disciplina a rerum medio coepit et ad initium post reversus est.'

'cur non illi quoque eadem furta temptarent? verum intellecturos facilius esse Herculi clavam quam Homero versum subripere¹;' et tamen destinasse secedere² ut omnia ad satietatem malevolorum decideret³.

¹ Macrobius, 5. 3. 16, no doubt drawing on the same sources as Suetonius: 'tria ex aequo impossibilia, vel Iovi fulmen vel Herculi clavam vel versum Homero subripere.'

² *secedere*, to go into retirement: see § 35.

³ *decideret*, if Gronovius is not right in conjecturing *recideret*, must apparently mean 'settle the doubtful points raised by his critics.' But this sense hardly agrees with the words *ad satietatem*, which can only mean 'till his critics were satisfied.'

III.

LIFE PREFIXED TO THE COMMENTARY OF SERVIUS.

Codices a Thilone adhibiti.

- | | |
|---|--|
| { | B. = Bernensis 363, saec. ix. |
| | K. = Caroliruhensis 186, saec. ix. |
| | L. = Lipsiensis, saec. x. |
| | H. = Hamburgensis, saec. xi. |
| | M. = Monacensis cod. lat. 6394, saec. xi. |
| | E. = Monacensis cod. lat. 18059, saec. xii. |
| | D. = Dresdensis, saec. xv. |
| | C. = Fuldensis, nunc Cassellanus, saec. ix. vel x. ineuntis. |
| | P. = Parisinus 1750, saec. x. |
| | F. = Floriacensis Danielis, nunc Bernensis 172, saec. ix. vel x. ineuntis. |
| { | G. = Bernensis 167, saec. x. |
| | Paris. = Parisinus 7959. |
| | Harl. = Harleianus 2782, quem ipse contuli, saeculo ix. adsignatus. |

Vergilii^a haec vita est. Patre Vergilio^b matre Magia^c fuit; civis Mantuanus, quae civitas est Venetiae. Diversis in locis operam litteris dedit; nam et Cremonae¹ et Mediolani et Neapoli studuit. Adeo autem verecundus^d fuit² ut ex moribus cognomen acceperit^e; nam dictus est Parthenias. Omni vita probatus uno tantum morbo laborabat; nam inpatiens libidinis

^a Virgilii *codd.* ^b Vergilio, figulo Paris. 7959: cf. Suetonius, 1. ^c Magia G. H. Harl. (g in rasura). maia B. Paris. M. E. ma-ia L. ^d verecundus Harl. Ecl. i. verecundissimus *codd. in hoc loco.* ^e acceperit Paris. acciperet cet. acceperit Thilo.

¹ Cremona, Mediolani: Suetonius, 6, 7. Neapoli, referring to the composition of the Georgics and Aeneid.

² Adeo autem . . . fuit: a confused abridgement of Suetonius, 9-11: *omni vita probatus* being apparently taken from *cetera sane vita et ore et animo tam probum constat.*

fuit. Primum ab hoc disticho incepit¹, quod factum est in Ballistam² latronem

Monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus;

Nocte die tutum carpe viator iter.

Scriptis etiam² septem sive octo libros hos: Cirin, Aetnam, Culicem, Priapeia, Catalepton³, Epigrammata, Copam, Diras. Postea³, ortis bellis civilibus inter Antonium et Augustum, Augustus victor Cremonensium agros, quia pro Antonio senserant, dedit militibus suis. Qui cum non sufficerent, his addidit agros Mantuanos, sublato non propter civium culpam sed propter vicinitatem⁴ Cremonensium; unde ipse in Bucolicis

⁴ Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae.

Amisissis ergo agris Romam venit et usus patrocinio Pollionis et Maecenatis⁵ solus agrum quem amiserat meruit⁶. Tunc ei⁶ proposuit Pollio ut carmen Bucolicum scriberet, quod eum constat triennio scripsisse et emendasse. Item proposuit Maecenas Georgica, quae scripsit emendavitque septem¹ annis. Postea ab Augusto Aeneidem⁷ propositam scripsit annis undecim, sed nec emendavit nec edidit^m; unde eam moriens prae-

¹ Ab hoc disticho incepit *scripsi*. primum a distichon caepit quod factum est *L.* primum coepit a distichon factum. . . *Harl.* primum ab hoc distichon factum est *Paris. H. M. E. Thilo.* primum distichon in balistam latronem composuit *G.* ² Ballistam *M. Harl. Thilo.* balistam *cet.* ballista

M. balista *cet.* ³ catalepton *V. Burmanni.* calepton *Paris.* catalectum *G.* catalecton *cet.* ⁴ vicinitatem *corr. al. man. e civitatem Harl.* ⁵ meruit adipisci *G.* sed adipisci *supra versum scripto.* recipere meruit *E.* ⁶ septem: VI vel VII *B.* VII *L.* (sed altera parte litterae attrita). VIII *Harl.* ^m nec edidit *Paris.* nec edidit *B.* nec edidit *M.* nec cecinit *G.* nec cecinit *E.* nec

¹ *Primum ab hoc disticho incepit*: see critical note. I suspect that these words represent the whole or certainly a part of what was written: compare below, 'ab amicis non coepit.' Comp. Suetonius, 17.

² *Scriptis etiam, &c.*: see Suetonius, 17, 19, and critical note.

³ *Postea . . . Cremonae*: this account is much fuller than that in Suetonius, 19. Was it taken from a completer edition of the memoir than that which has come down to us?

⁴ *Mantua, &c.* Ecl. 9. 28.

⁵ *Pollionis et Maecenatis*: Probus and Suetonius say, probably with more truth, Alfenus Varus, Asinius Pollio, and Cornelius Gallus; for Maecenas' part in the matter, see Suetonius, 20.

⁶ *Tunc ei, &c.* Compare Suetonius, 19. It seems clear from these passages that Suetonius supposed the composition of the Eclogues to have begun after Vergil's restoration to his estate; hence the supposed period of three years. See Essay, p. 48.

⁷ *Aeneidem*: Suetonius, 21. It is to be observed that the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid are here represented as tasks undertaken at the suggestion of the persons in whose honour they were written.

cepit incendi. Augustus vero, ne tantum opus periret, Tuccam et Varium¹ hac lege iussit emendare ut superflua demerent, nihil adderent tamen; unde et semiplenos eius invenimus versiculos, ut

Hic cursus^o fuit²;

et aliquos detractos, ut in principio; nam ab armis non coepit, sed sic;

Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
Carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
Ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono
Gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis
Arma virumque cano—

Et in secundo hos versus constat esse detractos^p;

aut ignibus³ aegra dedere.

Iamque adeo super unus eram, cum limina Vestae
Servantem et tacitam secreta in sede latentem
Tyndarida aspicio: dant clara^q incendia lucem
Erranti passimque oculos per cuncta ferenti.
Illa sibi infestos eversa ob Pergama Teucros
Et Danaum poenam^r et deserti coniugis iras
Praemetuens^s, Troiae et patriae communis Erinys,
Abdiderat sese atque aris invisā sedebat.
Exarsere ignes animo; subit ira cadentem
Uleisci patriam et sceleratas sumere poenas^t.
'Scilicet haec Spartam incolumis patriasque Mycenae
Aspiciet^u, partoque ibit regina triumpho,
Coniugiumque domumque patres natosque videbit,
Iliadum turba et Phrygiis comitata ministris?
Occiderit ferro Priamus^v? Troia arserit igni?

cecinit nec ad limam perduxit (nec—perduxit *man. al.*) *Harl.* ⁿ Tuccam *H.*
Harl. varrum *H.* varum *cet.* ^o cursus *Paris.* cursus *corr. e* currus *Harl.*
currus *cet.* ^p et in secundo libro aliquos versus posuerat quos constat esse
detractos, quos invenimus cum pervenerimus ad locum de quo detracti sunt *C. qui*
versus iamque adeo . . . ferebar *ad Aen. ii. 566 praebet.* ^q dira *Harl.*
^r Danaum poenam *E. Harl.* poenas *C.* poenas *Danaum Vulg.* ^s permetuens
B. ^t poenas *C. Harl.* poenam *E.* ^u aspiciat *L.* ^v Priamus *Troia*
C. E. troia manus *B.* Priamo ut *Troia Paris.* propria ut *troico G.* pro priam

¹ *Tuccam et Varium*: Suetonius, 41, 42.

² *Hic cursus fuit*: Aen. 1. 534.

³ *aut ignibus*, &c.: 2. 566. The following lines are not in the best MSS. of Vergil, nor are they mentioned by Suetonius: Servius on Aen. 2. 566 says, 'post hunc versum hi versus fuerunt qui a Tucca et Vario obliti sunt' (so Bergk).

Dardanium totiens sudarit^w sanguine litus?
 Non ita. Namque etsi nullum memorabile nomen
 Feminea in poena est, nec habet^x victoria laudem,
 Extinxisse nefas tamen et sumpsisse merentis
 Laudabor poenas, animumque explesse iuvabit
 *Ultricis famam^{1y} et cineres satiasse meorum.
 Talia iactabam et furiata mente ferebar^z,
 Cum mihi se non ante alias—

troia *L.* . . . priamo aut troico *H.* propriam ut Troia *M.* propriam ut troi^{co}, propriam
corr. e priamus, troico e troia Harl. ^w sudarit *C*². sudarat *B.* sudaret *C. G.*
L. H. M. E. Harl. ^x nec habet *exemplaria impressa.* habet haec *codd.*
Thilo. ^y Ultricis famam *B. G. Paris. L. H. M. E. Harl.* ultricis famae *C.*
ultricis flammae Vulg. ^z ferebam *Paris.*

¹ *Ultricis famam* is meaningless: the common reading 'ultricis flammae' is again questionable Latin, even if 'explere' were ever used with the genitive, which is very doubtful. Can the true reading be 'altricis famam'? 'To have satisfied the glory of my country and the ashes of my loved ones'? If so, it is necessary to suppose that a verse has fallen out after 'explesse iuvabit.' 'Altrix' is often used in poetry as an epithet of the place in which a person was born. 'Satiassse cineres' for 'satis fecisse' or 'satis dedisse cineribus' is surely not classical Latin; but it is a phrase which might conceivably be used by a clever imitator of Vergil who wished in his own way to render the sense of 'sat patriae Priamoque datum.'

IV.

LIFE TAKEN FROM THE MSS. KNOWN AS BERNENSES 172
 (SAEC. X), 167 (SAEC. IX-X).

Publius Vergilius Maro genere Mantuanus dignitate eques Romanus, natus idibus Octobribus Cn. Pompeio M. Crasso consulibus, ut primum se contulit Romae¹, studuit apud Epidium oratorem cum Caesare Augusto, unde cum omnibus Mantuanis agri auferrentur, quod Antonianis partibus favissent, huic solo² concessit memoria condiscipulatus, ut et ipse poeta testatur in Bucolicis dicendo *Deus nobis haec otia fecit*. In quibus ingenium suum expertus est, favorem quoque Caesaris emeruit, ac deinde Georgica conscripsit et in his corroborato ingenio eius Aeneida conscripsit, cui finem non potuit imponere raptus a fatiis; et ideo inveniuntur apud eum versus non peracti, quibus non supervixit ad replendum. Vixit annos LII amicitia usus imperatoris Augusti et aliorum complurium probatissimorum virorum.

^{1, 2} *Romae: solo*: so the MSS.

ESSAY ON THE POETRY OF VERGIL IN CONNECTION WITH HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

THE imperial system, of which the foundations were laid by Augustus, did not create the literature of the so-called Augustan age, or seriously modify its form, or influence it to any great extent by patronage, but found it already existing, the genuine and spontaneous product of the later years of the republic. The men of letters on their side did not as a rule greet the advent of the new political order with much satisfaction, or acquiesce in the growing power of the Caesars as clients in that of their patron, or servants in that of their master. Before Vergil and Horace, the great writers of Italy had mostly attached themselves to the cause of the republic. The achievements of Julius Caesar for the first time drew some of the foremost writers over to the other side, and with some reason, for he had apparently shewn, as none of the popular leaders had shewn before him, that the new order of things was compatible not only with the formation of a strong government, but also with the encouragement of learning and letters. In the civil and foreign wars which followed on the murder of Julius Caesar, Antonius discredited himself completely by his failure in the Parthian campaign of B.C. 36, and by his subsequent display of unpatriotic and anti-national feeling. He was not the man to save the Roman empire from its Eastern enemies or to encourage the preservation of the nobler elements in the Roman character. Thus Octavianus succeeded, but not without a great struggle, to the position as well as to the name of his uncle. Italy, long

torn with civil wars, had been a prey to confusion and distraction of which the existing literature only gives us a faint conception.

Under the government of Octavianus there was at least a prospect of peace and immunity from the weary contentions of rival factions. But the intimacy which grew up between Octavianus and some of the great writers of his time did not imply more than the relation which, in the Italy of this period, often existed between a poor poet and his powerful friend in public life. For as the men of nobler character among the Roman aristocracy were mostly ambitious of achieving literary success themselves, and were sometimes really successful in achieving it; as they had formed a high and manly ideal of individual culture, not being content with mastering only one accomplishment or branch of knowledge, but aiming at excellence in literature and philosophy as well as in politics and the art of war, so they looked as a rule with a kindly eye on the men of talent or genius who, with less wealth and social resources than their own, were engaged in the great work of improving the national literature. There were many such in the last century and a-half of the republic, especially among the *equites* or upper *bourgeoisie* of Italy and Rome; men whose families, though wealthy enough to maintain a respectable position, were not ennobled by office or aristocratic descent. The names of Ennius and Lucilius, the friends of the Scipios and of Laelius, occur at once in this connection, and the fact is abundantly illustrated by other examples. Catullus is the friend of the Metelli and of Manlius Torquatus, Varius Gallus Vergil and Horace of Asinius Pollio, of Maecenas, and of Octavianus long before he became *princeps*, Tibullus and Propertius of Messala. If poor, as Vergil and Horace were, a man of letters might look for substantial assistance from his friends in high place: assistance which, in the then existing state of public opinion they considered it only natural to offer, and which it brought no slur on him to accept. In his comprehensive love of letters and learning Octavianus shewed himself a worthy successor to Julius Caesar, and the friendship which he extended to poets and scholars was, so far as we can see, uninfluenced by party considerations. This is notably so in the case of Horace, who was in his

youth a republican, and had fought on the side of the oligarchy at Philippi with Brutus and Cassius; indeed it is notorious that the friendship of Augustus was not of his seeking, but was more or less forced upon him by the Emperor, who, like Sulla, was apprehensive that the task of celebrating his exploits might chance to fall into incompetent hands. It is of course true that Vergil and Horace, and still more Ovid, speak of the *princeps* and the consolidation of the Roman power under him in terms which, if rendered literally into modern English and interpreted according to modern ways of thinking, savour of flattery and exaggeration. But it must be remembered that such words as *deus*, *divus*, and *divinus*, when applied to a man, though displeasing to the saner feeling of the old-fashioned Romans, conveyed much less to Italian ears than their English equivalents do to our own. The word *divinus* is constantly used in impassioned prose like that of Cicero as an epithet of extraordinary men and great achievements; nor, when applied to the *princeps*, although in this connection they carried with them, in the Roman religious system, a definite religious association, did *deus* and *divus* of necessity imply more than what lay at the root of so much of the Greek and Roman religion, mere admiration of commanding merit. The power which at length secured peace to the distracted and tottering empire seemed to its mixed population as divine as many others among the numerous objects to which their worship had attached itself, and men of letters followed the feeling of the people, less ignorantly, no doubt, yet not without sincerity. For the successful cultivation of literature demands security of property, leisure, and an undisturbed mind; it is peace for which Lucretius prays in his immortal prelude, peace which the authority of the *princeps* was beginning, for the first time since the civil wars of Marius and Sulla, to establish in Italy. It is probable that the despotic tendencies involved in the division of power between the *princeps* and the senate were but imperfectly realized by Augustus and Tiberius; indeed a strong effort was made by those illustrious men to avoid anything which might bear the appearance of a regal or uncitizenlike bearing. And the literary men who espoused the cause of the Caesars were, in all likelihood, mainly concerned about the change from constant civil war to a fair prospect of

tranquillity, and from a worse to a better government of the Roman empire. They did not foresee those literary results which to us, to whom Roman history is a thing of the past, seem as melancholy as they were apparently inevitable.

I have said so much before proceeding to examine the life of Vergil in detail in order to obviate a fallacy implied in a great deal of current criticism, that the Augustan literature was the artificial product of a despotic constitution, fostered by the patronage of an imperial court. It was not yet time to say *et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum*. As far as Vergil is concerned it would almost be sufficient to refer to dates, which shew that the poet was thirty-nine years old and had nearly finished the Georgics when the victory of Actium put anything like absolute power into the hands of Augustus. But a continuous examination of the facts of his life in relation to current events will afford the best means of illustrating the details and general bearing of the question. It will be seen that in the years of agony, vindictive passion, confusion, and insecurity which followed Pharsalia and Philippi, the voices of the poets echo in living accents the natural feelings of their time, and help us materially in realizing the inner movements of a period of which the existing historical authorities give only a superficial and fragmentary idea. This is the general and the most interesting aspect of Vergil's life, but it must be added that the details of the subject require fresh treatment. There are several points which the most recent works have not fully cleared up, but which may, I think, on a further examination be elucidated at least with some degree of probability. The following observations may, I hope, be not unacceptable as suggesting solutions which I wish to be thoroughly sifted by competent critics, and accepted or rejected as they deserve. And first a few words on our authorities.

The life of Vergil attributed to Donatus has been well edited, in its genuine or uninterpolated form, by Reifferscheid and Hagen. That it is in the main the work of Suetonius is a theory held by both these scholars, by Ribbeck, who has gone over this ground in his preface to the Teubner text of Vergil, and by Comparetti; nor do I gather that Professor Sellar disputes this conclusion. But Roth has hesitated to print this life in his

fragments of Suetonius; and I do not know that any scholar has, recently at least, taken the trouble to prove in detail an important proposition which, although completely supported by the general impression left upon the reader by the style and manner of the work, ought certainly not to be accepted without proof. That this memoir, or the great bulk of it, was written by Suetonius is to my mind morally certain, and I will state as briefly as possible the reasons which have led me to this conclusion.

This is a case in which our chief reliance must be placed upon internal evidence; yet there are certain probabilities about it which, though they do not reach the force of direct external evidence, go far to support the arguments drawn from the style, language, and syntax of the work. Aelius Donatus prefixed to his commentary on Terence a life admittedly taken from Suetonius; it is hardly conceivable that Suetonius, in his Lives of the Poets, should have omitted Vergil; it is not likely that if he did write one, Donatus, when commenting on Vergil, would go to any other source for his information; for Suetonius was the favourite authority for students of history and biography in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. I need do no more, in this connection, than allude to the frequent use to which his writings are put by Jerome. I should not, however, be justified in laying much stress on these general presumptions were they not, to my mind, strongly confirmed by considerations drawn from the style, the arrangement, the language, and the syntax of the work before us. The style is, in the main, the peculiar style of Suetonius; the Latin is the quiet, sober, terse, unaffected and yet distinguished Latin which characterizes him among other writers of his period, and separates him from the later writers of the *Historia Augusta*. The memoir starts in the true Suetonian manner, in which the place of birth is expressed by an adjective: *P. Vergilius Mantuanus*, like *L. Orbilius Pupillus Beneventanus*, *Q. Remnius Palaemon Vicetinus*, *Pacuvius Brutus Andusinus*, *P. Terentius Karthaginensis*, *Cornelius Gallus Foroniliensis*, *Q. Horatius Flaccus Venusinus*. With regard to the arrangement, I wish to draw particular attention to a peculiarity of Suetonius which occurs also in the Life of Vergil, but which I have not observed in any of the writers of the *Historia*

Augusta. It is this, that the description of the person and habits and character of his heroes almost always immediately precedes his account of their studies and literary efforts. I have noticed this arrangement in his lives of Julius, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, and Domitian; though I must admit that it is not observed in the short life of Terence.

Again, Suetonius is particular in giving where he can the exact time at which a man lost his parents: *annum agens xvi, quadrimus, patrem amisit*, and the like. Just in this manner our Life says of Vergil, *parentes iam grandis amisit*. Another mannerism of Suetonius which our Life also exhibits is the constant quotation of verses or lines of poetry to support or illustrate or give point to his statements.

The general character of the syntax is undoubtedly Suetonian, though it would perhaps be impossible to single out any one usage which could not be paralleled from other writers of the same period of Latin. It is far purer than that of the fourth century A.D. The constant use of the conjunctions *siquidem* = *since*, *sed et* = *also, moreover*, and of the perfect subjunctive after *ut* final where a more classical writer would have used the imperfect—these are phenomena which it is easy to illustrate from the Latin prose of the early second century and succeeding periods; but it must be observed that both Suetonius and our biographer are very fond of these usages. There is, however, an idiom occurring in this Life which calls for special remark, as I have so far found it illustrated in Suetonius alone, though approximations to it may be found in Tacitus; I mean the use of *non perinde* without any explanatory clause. Our Life, in speaking of Vergil's unfinished lines, says that writers who tried to complete them '*non perinde valuerunt ob difficultatem*;' 'did not succeed to their mind.' Now this noticeable construction also occurs in Suetonius' Life of Terence; '*quos non perinde exprimeret in scriptis*,' 'characters which he did not represent as he would have liked;' Augustus, 80, '*crure sinistro non perinde valebat*,' 'he was not so strong in his left leg as his right;' Tib. 52, '*ne mortuo quidem perinde adfectus est*,' 'so much moved as he should have been;' Galba, 13, '*quare adventus eius non perinde gratus fuit*,' 'so welcome as was expected.' The last three instances I owe to Ritschl's

commentary on the Life of Terence, the fact which I wish to lay stress upon is that they are all drawn from Suetonius.

Turning to the language, we find in our Life of Vergil several words which are more or less favourites with Suetonius. I have noticed *aquilus* of complexion (Aug. 79, 'inter aquilum candidumque'); *secessus* with the genitive of the place to which retreat is made, *secessus Campaniae*, for *the quiet of Campania*; *formare* of putting a composition into its first shape; *auspicari* with the accusative in the sense of *to enter upon, begin*; *liberalitates* in the sense of *presents*, *pronus* of a character inclined to passionate excess, *genitura* for horoscope, *novissime* in the numerical sense of *last* in an enumeration. These and similar points I have touched upon in the commentary prefixed to this essay. The converging force of the arguments I have dwelt on tends, I think, to prove almost irrefragably that our memoir is the work of Suetonius: for it must be remembered that the numerous marks of the Suetonian style occur in the space of only a few pages. There are indeed one or two passages which may be due either to Donatus himself or to some other hand, but this fact does not affect the general style and character of the work.

Besides this Life, which was prefixed to Donatus' commentary on Vergil, there is a far shorter one which stands at the beginning of the commentary of Servius. I am not sure that it has been observed, as I think it ought to be, that this Life, with the exception of one or two not very important statements, is a lame abridgement of the Life attributed to Donatus, and need hardly therefore be considered as an independent authority. For a detailed substantiation of this statement I must refer to the notes appended to this Life, p. 21.

The fragment of a memoir attributed to Valerius Probus, though containing one gross historical error, is, as far as it goes, so good, that we can only wish that more of it had survived. As far as I can judge, I should be inclined to conjecture that this work was compiled independently from the same materials as those used by Suetonius. It will be seen from the notes (p. 7) that the text as we have it is unsound.

In the main, then, it would appear that we must rely for our knowledge of Vergil's life on his biography by Suetonius,

together with such light as we can obtain from his poems themselves, from the early commentators on them, and from the historians of the period. Suetonius was a conscientious collector of facts, who was careful to draw upon the best available sources and to sift his evidence with sense and discernment. In the case of Vergil he probably drew upon sources reaching back to the time of the poet himself. Memoirs of Vergil were written by the poet Varius and by other friends, one of whom was Melissus, a freedman of Maecenas. A fragment of correspondence, no doubt taken directly or indirectly from the same sources, is preserved by Macrobius; and a few anecdotes are found in Seneca and in Aulus Gellius. Varius is the authority for the statement, which appears both in Quintilian and Suetonius, that Vergil was in the habit of writing a very few verses every day; and Suetonius, though he does not mention Varius' name in this connection, may have drawn upon his memoir for more facts than this, for nothing is commoner with classical writers than to borrow without naming their sources. In one case he acknowledges his debt to Melissus, in another to Asconius, who in the early part of the first century wrote a work in answer to the attacks of Vergil's detractors. Ribbeck infers, I think somewhat too hastily, that the work of Asconius was the main authority upon which the memoir of Suetonius is based. It seems to me rather to suggest a compendium carefully put together from several sources.

It is the more important to dwell upon the paramount authority of the memoir by Suetonius, as a vague and false tradition of Vergil's life was current even in well-informed literary circles by the end of the first century A.D. It is surprising to find Martial (8. 56) giving a wholly inaccurate summary of the main facts, representing for instance Maecenas, not Augustus, as restoring Vergil to his farm, and the Aeneid as undertaken immediately after the *Culex*. Lucan and Statius¹, again, appear to have thought that the *Culex* was written in Vergil's twenty-seventh year, though speaking of it as his first attempt in the way of

¹ Suetonius, Vita Lucani: 'ut praefatione quadam aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere *Et quantum mihi restat Ad Culi cem*,' i.e. though only twenty-four I have still some time left before I am as old as Vergil was when he wrote the *Culex*: Statius Silvae, 1 praef., 2. 7. 73.

poetry; an impossible combination, as it is abundantly clear that by his twenty-seventh year, if not before, Vergil had begun his Eclogues, in which he almost attained the full ripeness of his style. Here the testimony of Suetonius, that the *Culex* was written in his seventeenth year, is far more consonant to the probabilities of the case.

Having thus attempted to clear the ground, I will go on to consider the life of Vergil continuously in relation to his poems, dwelling chiefly upon such points as seem to require fresh elucidation.

Andes, the birthplace of the poet, is said in our text of Probus to have been thirty Roman miles distant from Mantua; a statement which, though accepted by Mommsen in his account of Mantua in the fifth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, I cannot but regard as mistaken, if the MS. tradition be correct. For it is hard to see how Vergil could say of himself in his own epitaph *Mantua me genuit*, how Suetonius could call him *Mantuanus* and say that Andes his birthplace was not far from Mantua, if he had really been born some seventeen English miles away: why indeed, in this case, should he have been a citizen of Mantua at all? Mantua had only a small territory, and any one born at such a distance from it would probably have become a citizen either of Cremona, or Brixia, or Verona, or Vicetia, or Patavium. The tradition which identifies Andes with Pietole, a village two or three miles from Mantua, seems to be nearer the truth than the statement, if statement it be, of Probus.

The rustic character of Vergil's early surroundings was noticed by his detractors in antiquity: *Veneto rusticis parentibus nato, inter silvas et frutices educto*, says the critic in Macrobius, 5. 2. 1.

His father is said to have raised himself from the position of a hired servant to that of his master's son-in-law, and to have increased his substance by buying up tracts of forest-land and by keeping bees. Remembering that Vergil was born in B.C. 70, we may conjecture that his father took advantage of the confusion of the period of the Sullan proscriptions to make cheap purchases of land. Doubtless there is many a reminiscence of Vergil's early years in the Georgics, where his love of the woods in which he must have wandered as a boy meets us on every page. His mother's name, Magia, has probably much to do with the middle-age fable which made the poet into a

magician. How he came into possession of the little farm of which we hear so much in the Eclogues there is nothing to shew. Vergil received the rudiments of his education in the neighbouring city of Cremona, already the mother of two poets, Furius Bibaculus who was nearly thirty years Vergil's senior, and his much nearer contemporary Quintilius Varus, the intimate friend both of himself and of Horace. But Vergil's father, like Horace's, though born in a humble station, seems to have had the honourable ambition of securing for his son the best education then attainable, for in his fifteenth year the boy was taken to Milan, and soon after (in his seventeenth year) to Rome. His genius, unlike that of Lucretius and Catullus, who died respectively at the ages of forty-one and of thirty, was not quickly developed. Still there is little doubt that he began to write poetry when quite a boy. His earliest known production is a couplet on a robber named Ballista (Suetonius, 17).

The collection which commonly goes by the unintelligible name *catalecton*, has been, I think rightly, re-named by Bergk and Unger (*Neue Jahrbücher*, 1876, p. 429) *catalepton* (τὰ κατὰ λεπτόν, or minor poems). Bergk relied on MS. evidence and the general probabilities of the case; but Unger has supplemented his arguments by two passages from the Greek Life of Aratus, in which the phrase τὰ κατὰ λεπτόν is twice used, and apparently in this sense. This collection contains several pieces which shew a close study and imitation of Catullus, and this is just what might be expected of Vergil's boyhood. Whoever is the author of these poems, they undoubtedly belong to different periods. The seventh, if by Vergil, must have been written in his seventeenth year or thereabouts (B.C. 53): the tenth refers to his ejection from his farm, and must therefore belong to the year 41. The date and the subject of the twelfth have been matter of much doubt. The subject of the poem is a prince who is represented as having convulsed the great world with war, having crushed the kings and peoples of Asia, and as threatening Rome herself with destruction, when suddenly, driven from his country by exile, he falls headlong from his eminence. I have recently fallen upon a hypothesis with regard to this piece which is, so far as I am aware, a new one, and requires therefore to be substantiated in detail. The words of the poem are:—

Aspice quem valido subnixum gloria regno
Altius et caeli sedibus extulerat :
Terrarum hic bello magnum concusserat orbem,
Hic reges Asiae fregerat, hic populos,
Hic grave servitium tibi iam, tibi, Roma, ferebat,
Cetera namque viri cuspide conciderant,
Cum subito in medio rerum certamine praeceps
Corruit, e patria pulsus in exilium.
Tale deae numen, tali mortalia ritu
Fallax momento temporis hora tulit.

Scholars have thought of Mithradates and Pompeius Magnus : but it is impossible with any semblance of probability to refer this poem to either of them. For the Mithradatic war was in Vergil's time a thing of the past, and Pompeius Magnus could never, not even in his third consulship, have been described as raised on high in firmly established royalty. Nor, again, were either Mithradates or Pompeius banished, in the strict sense of the word, from their country. There is however a prince to whom, supposing the poem to have been written in Vergil's time at all, it will I think exactly apply in all particulars ; I mean Phraates king of Parthia. This monarch, after ascending the throne in 37 B.C. and signaling his accession by murders and cruelties committed upon his own brothers, thus alienating many nobles (and among them Monaeses) from his cause, proved a formidable enemy to the Romans. In 36 B.C. he defeated Caecilius Stadianus on the Euphrates, destroyed his army, and took prisoner Polemo king of Pontus. Soon afterwards he compelled Antonius to retreat into Armenia with heavy losses, which were before long disastrously increased by the winter march to the frontier. His successes over the Romans made Phraates more haughty and overbearing, so that as early as 35 B.C. the Medes are described as discontented with him for failing to give them their due share of the spoil.

In 34 B.C. Armenia was occupied by the Romans in spite of the opposition of Artaxias son of Artavasdes, who was conquered in this year by the Medes. In the following year, 33, Antonius again advanced as far as the Araxes, formed an alliance with Media, and made over Lesser Armenia to Polemo. But the tide of Roman success was checked by the withdrawal of the troops of Antonius, which were now required to help their general in the impending civil war. The Medes were at once defeated

and their king taken prisoner by Phraates, and thus, as Dio says, Armenia and Media ἀπώλοντο, were destroyed, or (perhaps) lost to the Romans.

Phraates was now at the height of his power; but his insolence and cruelty became unbearable. An insurrection headed by Tiridates drove him from his throne and country, to which he was afterwards again restored by the help of the Scythians¹.

Now, supposing our poem to have been written just after the Parthian revolution and the banishment of Phraates, we shall find every allusion in it cleared up. Phraates had been raised to heaven on the throne of the Arsacidae; he had shaken the world with war; he had taken prisoner, first Polemo king of Pontus, and then the kings of Media and Armenia. I take this to be the meaning of *hic reges Asiae fregerat, hic populos*. He was threatening Rome herself; the Parthians, as Horace says, were ready to fall upon Latium; but in the midst of the world-wide conflict (*in medio rerum certamine*) he falls and is driven suddenly into exile: *cum multa crudeliter consuleret*, says Justin, *in exilium a populo suo pellitur*.

I have therefore little hesitation in assigning this poem to the period immediately following the exile of Phraates, 33 or 32 B.C. It thus probably synchronizes roughly with Horace's seventh epode, *sed ut secundum vota Parthorum sua Urbs haec periret dextera*, and the twenty-sixth ode of the first book, *quis sub Arcto Rex gelidae metuatur orae*, &c. In the last line but one, *tale deae numen*, &c., who is *deae*? No doubt either Nemesis or Fortuna; but probably, I think, the latter: comp. Tibullus, 2. 5. 46, *tandem ad Troianos diva superba venit*: at any rate, if this interpretation be the true one, the poem will in its ideas be a companion-piece to the thirty-fifth ode of Horace's first book, *O diva gratum quae regis Antium*. For in this ode there is also, I think, an allusion to the fortunes of Phraates. At least it is difficult to suggest a more suitable reference for the lines (*te*) *regumque matres barbarorum et Purpurei metuunt tyranni, Iniurioso ne pede proruas Stantem columnam, neu populus frequens Ad arma cessantes, ad arma Concitet, imperiumque frangat. Reges barbarorum* may well be the Eastern princes whom Phraates slew

¹ Dio, 49. 23 foll.; 51. 18; Justin, 42. 5.

or imprisoned: *purpurei tyranni* may mean Phraates himself. Horace mentions the Dacians and the Scythians in the same context. Now the Dacians were helping Antonius, and the Scythians Phraates, in 32-31 B.C., and the occurrence of their names in this connection is therefore in favour of my hypothesis, which I now leave to the consideration and criticism of scholars.

Let us now return to Vergil, whom we left a boy of sixteen at Rome, beginning, after the fashion of his time, the study of rhetoric. Like Propertius and Ovid, he had been set by his father to study law, for we hear of his conducting one case in a court of law, and one only. But although Vergil studied rhetoric under the best professors, among them Epidius the master of both Antonius and Octavianus, he made little or no progress in the art. The notion of the Berne biography (see p. 24) that Octavianus was his fellow-student in the school of Epidius, though not decidedly rejected (if I understand him rightly) by Ribbeck, must surely be regarded as a natural fiction of later tradition; for Octavianus was at this time nine years old. Augustus, it is true, is said to have recited a funeral speech over his mother's grave when a boy of twelve: but to imagine him studying rhetoric at nine would be to make too much even of his precocious talent.

From rhetoric Vergil, like many other distinguished Romans, proceeded in the ordinary course to philosophy, for which he never lost his taste till the end of his life. His master was Siron, a celebrated Epicurean, under the influence of whose teaching Vergil remained for many years, almost, we may conjecture, up to the time when the *Georgics* were published. He had probably given up Epicureanism for a form of Platonism by the time when he wrote the sixth *Aeneid*; but the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* shew marked traces of its influence. The boy threw himself into his new study with all the ardour of youthful hope, and naturally, for the vision of a life of moral happiness, marred neither by entanglement from without nor passion nor superstition from within, long exercised a powerful fascination on many of the loftier minds in antiquity; Epicureanism was not a creed only, but a life. If we may take the seventh poem of the *κατὰ λεπτὸν* as expressing the poet's real feeling at this

time, it is clear that he looked to philosophy to deliver him from pedantry and rhetoric, and to purify such poetry as he intended to write in future; for he did not intend to write much. The sweet Muses are bidden to depart, and with them youthful love and the beautiful comrades of his boyhood. As for the great masters of learning as it was then understood, Aelius Stilo and Terentius Varro, they are a tribe of pedants soaking in fat, the tinkling cymbals of the idle class-room (*scholasticorum natio madens pingui; inanis cymbalon iuventutis*). But Vergil probably, if we may judge by the traces of antiquarian study in the Aeneid, learned in after years to form a very different opinion of Roman scholarship.

According to Suetonius, Vergil wrote the *Culex* at the age of sixteen, that is, just at the time at which we have now arrived. The literary tradition preserved by Lucan, Statius and Martial points to this poem as his first serious and elaborate work. We still possess a long and dreary hexameter poem called *Culex*, ending with the two lines quoted as its conclusion by Suetonius. Of this piece it is, with our present data, difficult if not impossible to decide whether it is as a whole or in part the work of Vergil. Its length would correspond with what might be expected in a boy's first elaborate effort; it contains reminiscences of Lucretius, who had died two years before Vergil's *Culex* was written; it contains also passages of rhetorical commonplace, the subjects of which resemble those of some of Vergil's later work, but of which it is hard to say whether they are first drafts or later imitations. The subject is trivial and the handling bad, full of wordy rhetoric and weak puerile exaggeration. In these facts there is nothing to determine whether the poem in its entirety is the genuine production of Vergil, or his genuine production interpolated, or altogether a forgery.

We are now at a turning-point in Vergil's life. In his boyhood, and before his introduction to the study of philosophy, he had in all probability written occasional pieces of lyric and lampoon in the style of Catullus. The literary career of Catullus more than covered, in point of time, the years of Vergil's early boyhood, and nothing is more natural than that the susceptible young poet should have been deeply influenced by the style

of his illustrious elder contemporary. But partly the growth of Vergil's own mind, partly the study of philosophy, partly his respect for Lucretius, for Helvius Cinna the learned and admired of Catullus¹, for Varius the epic and Asinius Pollio the tragic poet, may have given a more serious turn to his aspirations. We are told (and his own language bears out the notion) that before writing the Eclogues he attempted a poem on the history of Rome, but found the subject little to his liking. Probably the years of his early manhood were spent in study rather than in production; but by his twenty-sixth or twenty-seventh year he appears as the originator of an elaborate kind of poetry altogether new in Latin literature.

So much really excellent criticism of all kinds has been brought to bear upon the Eclogues that I only propose to touch upon a few historical questions which seem still to admit of a more satisfactory treatment than they have yet received. The third Eclogue speaks of Asinius Pollio as favouring Vergil and encouraging his studies in pastoral poetry; and Asinius Pollio was appointed *legatus* in Gallia Cisalpina in the year 43. It is possible then that this Eclogue was written not later than this year, the twenty-seventh of Vergil's age: though it must be admitted that Pollio's appointment cannot be taken as a decisive landmark. The first great difficulty that occurs is with regard to the Daphnis, or fifth Eclogue, which in Suetonius' opinion was Vergil's tribute of affection to his brother Flaccus, but which others among the ancient interpreters of the poem referred to Julius-Caesar. I confess that, in spite of Ribbeck's repudiation of this idea, it still appears to me, as I am glad to see that it does to Mr. Sellar, deserving of serious attention. Caesar, who had been patron of Gallia Transpadana since 68 B.C., had in the year 49 conferred the Roman citizenship on its inhabitants, thereby attaching the whole region to his cause, and among them very probably the family of Vergil. In any case there seems no doubt that Vergil's attachment to the cause of Caesar, like that of Varius and unlike that of Horace, was lifelong and heartfelt.

The Roman world was shaken as by an earthquake at the assassination of the great dictator; what Vergil felt is clearly

¹ Kiessling, in the *Commentationes Philologicae* in honour of Mommsen, makes it probable that Helvius Cinna was a native of Brixia (p. 354).

shewn by the conclusion of the first Georgic; and the Daphnis is conceived on a broader and loftier scale than might be expected in a poem intended only to enshrine a private grief. Caesar was formally recognized as *divus*, and an object of public worship in the year 43 B.C., but the multitude at Rome had by a spontaneous act begun to venerate him in this way almost immediately after his funeral. Suetonius, Iul. 88, says, *in deorum numerum relatus est non ore modo decernentium sed et opinione vulgi*. Nothing therefore would be more natural than that Vergil, already attached on public grounds to his cause, should catch the popular feeling and embody it after his fashion in an allegorical poem. The grandeur and elevation of the language of this Eclogue would in every way suit so great a subject; and there are two minor details on which, though not wishing to lay much stress upon them, I cannot but dwell for a moment, for a little light in such a matter is better than none. In Suetonius' Life of Julius Caesar there are two fancies mentioned which appear in the fifth Eclogue. One is, that on the night before his assassination Caesar dreamed that he was soaring above the clouds and touching the right hand of Jupiter himself. The reader is irresistibly reminded of Vergil's *can-didus insuetum miratur limen Olympi Sub pedibusque videt nubes et sidera Daphnis*: in the sheen of his divinity he looks for the first time on the threshold of heaven and sees the clouds and stars beneath his feet:—

‘Where the deep transported mind may soar
Above the wheeling poles, and at Heaven's door
Look in and see each blissful deity
How he before the thunderous throne doth lie.’

The other has been noticed by Spohn and subsequent commentators—it was said that a number of horses which Caesar had consecrated and set free in the neighbourhood of the Rubicon, for some days before his murder shed floods of tears and refused to touch any food. *Non ulli pastos illis egere diebus Frigida Daphni boves ad flumina; nulla nec amnem Libavit quadrupes nec graminis attigit herbam*. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the words *Daphnis thiasos inducere Bacchi* (*instituit*) (Ecl. 5. 29) are explained by Servius as alluding to new rites in honour of Liber introduced by Julius Caesar.

I now pass on to the year 41 B.C., the time of war and confiscation, when the territory of Cremona and part also of that of Mantua were parcelled out by the triumvirs among their veterans. The ill-fortune of Mantua brought with it a bad time for the poet and his family, who were expelled from their estate and fled for refuge to the villa of Siron, Vergil's master in the Epicurean philosophy. In a touching little poem, now placed tenth among the *κατὰ λεπτόν*, Vergil commits himself and those whom he loved, but especially, as he says, his father, to the little villa.

The times were full of discord and dismay, of which only a few faint echoes survive in the Eclogues and in the anonymous poems called the *Dirae*, which must evidently be assigned to this period. At the end of the year 41 war again broke out between Octavianus and Lucius Antonius: Asinius Pollio, Vergil's friend, who was allied with the latter, was removed from his position of *legatus* in Cisalpine Gaul, and Alfenus Varus was put in his place. Whether this was the Varus who had been Vergil's fellow-student is not certain; however this may be, verses addressed to him by Vergil and interceding for Mantua are mentioned in the ninth Eclogue. This poem purports to be a dialogue between Lycidas and Moeris about the dispossession of Menalcas, who (as Quintilian, probably drawing upon earlier commentators, assures us) is doubtless Vergil himself. They complain that his songs have had no power to secure him in the possession of his estate; Lycidas and Moeris too could sing, Lycidas not as an inspired bard, but as a writer of verses; but now they are too sad to sing; Menalcas their poet has been robbed of his home and nearly slain. Whether Lycidas and Moeris represent friends of Vergil, or whether they are simply personifications of his various feelings, it is impossible to say; the general scope of the poem is, however, clear enough through the mist of allegory. Mantua has been sacrificed in spite of Vergil's intercession; Vergil has been ejected with violence from his farm in spite of his achievements as a poet. The first Eclogue represents Tityrus, that is Vergil, reinstated in the possession of his farm by the favour of Octavianus, and in a rapture of gratitude and veneration towards the 'god' who has restored him.

In this short account of the transactions alluded to in the

ninth and first Eclogues I have, as will be observed, assumed that Vergil was only once ejected from his farm and once restored to it. As the current theory on the matter, accepted as far as I know by all scholars, is that Vergil was twice ejected, once before he wrote the first Eclogue, and then again before he wrote the ninth, I must ask for the indulgence of my readers if I go into the question in some detail.

The first Eclogue represents Vergil as restored to the possession of his estate; the ninth complains of his violent expulsion from it. Servius and (I think) all modern critics explain this fact by saying that after the poet had been restored by Octavianus (Ecl. 1) he was again expelled (Ecl. 9), and afterwards, at some time not mentioned, again reinstated.

I am disposed to think that the notion of a double ejection rests on no sufficient evidence. As far as I know, the only good authorities which support it are Servius on the first Eclogue, and other commentators (*alii*) whom he quotes on the ninth. Now the two Eclogues themselves, it must be observed, lend no real support to the hypothesis, but rather the reverse. In the ninth Vergil says, 'That has happened which we never thought possible; a stranger has turned Menalcas out of his farm.' How could it appear impossible, if it had happened once already, and only a few months before? The poem proceeds: "I had heard a rumour that Menalcas' songs had kept his property safe." "Yes, and it was a mere rumour; for songs go for nothing amid the din of arms." These words are generally taken as implying that Vergil, after his estate had been given back to him by Octavianus, had been again driven out; all that they need mean is that he had hoped at one time to retain his farm, but that it had after all been taken away. It may well be that when the first order came for the confiscation of the Mantuan territory, Vergil made interest with Pollio for at least the temporary preservation of it; hence the rumour alluded to. Had Vergil actually gone to Rome and returned with an order from Octavianus for its restoration, is it conceivable that there should not be some distinct allusion in the poem to so important a fact? Yet the only allusion to Octavianus is contained in the lines, *Ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum, Astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus et quo*

Duceret apricis in collibus uva colorem; the true interpretation of which must surely be, 'The star of Caesar has appeared, under which the fields *ought to be rejoicing* in their fruits and the hill-vineyards in their grapes.' It is the complaint of the fifth Eclogue and the first Georgic, that the overthrow of Caesar's power has brought in its train the ruin of tillage. To my mind these lines imply no more than that Vergil has yet some faint hope in the generosity of Octavianus.

Turning to the ancient commentators, we find that Probus, whose account of this matter is, as Mommsen has seen, clearer and more reasonable than that of Servius, says that Octavianus ordered the territory of Mantua to be confiscated in case that of Cremona were not sufficient; that Vergil thus lost his estate, but had it restored on being introduced to Octavianus by Cornelius Gallus; that the veterans were so irritated at this that Vergil was nearly killed by the *primipilaris* Milienius Toro; that the Eclogues were not published in the order in which they were written, for the ninth, a complaint of injury, ought to be placed before the first, which is an expression of gratitude for the redress of the injury. It follows from this that Probus, who seems to have followed the same sources of information as Suetonius, regarded the first Eclogue as referring to the final restoration of Vergil to his estate, subsequent to the act of violence of which complaint is made in the ninth.

✓Neither Suetonius' Life of Vergil nor the verses of Focas make any mention of a double ejection. But Servius on the first Eclogue, in explaining the relation of the ninth Eclogue to the first, says that after the first Eclogue was written Vergil went back to his estate; was then almost killed, not by Milienius Toro, but by one Arrius, saved himself by leaping into the Mincio, and afterwards (when does not appear) had his estate again restored by Octavianus. ✓The ninth Eclogue Servius places after the first, and so do 'others' whom he quotes, who however give a totally different account of the transaction. According to them, Vergil, after obtaining *immunitas agrorum* from Octavianus, fell into a dispute with his neighbour about his boundaries; a neighbour named Clodius threatened to kill him and pursued him with a drawn sword, but Vergil escaped into a charcoal-burner's shop.

I much doubt whether it is worth while attempting, as Ribbeck does, to weave these different accounts into a consistent story. It is clear that, as is natural in such a case, different versions of the facts must have existed in Servius' time, and very probably much earlier; the question is, what does the best evidence, that of the Eclogues themselves, warrant us in inferring? The commentators were evidently somewhat puzzled by the fact of the ninth Eclogue coming after the first. The difficulty is noticed by Probus, who accounts for it in a rational way: but I suspect that Servius and the authorities whom he quotes, misled by the order in which the Eclogues stand, arranged the facts so as to put the ninth chronologically subsequent to the first. I believe that Probus was right in supposing the ninth to have been written first, and the first to refer to the final restitution of Vergil's estate. This supposition is not contradicted by the mention of Varus in the ninth Eclogue, supposing him, as we must suppose, to be the Alfenus Varus who had succeeded Pollio as *legatus* in Cisalpine Gaul. For Suetonius expressly says that it was this Varus, with Asinius Pollio and Gallus, whose influence secured to Vergil the possession of his estate. In other words, the entreaties addressed to Varus in the ninth Eclogue were successful, Varus not caring to pursue his political differences with Pollio so far as to injure Pollio's friend.

These events led to the commencement of Vergil's nearer acquaintance with Maecenas. Here the testimony of Suetonius is clear and simple; Maecenas, he says, had assisted Vergil when little known to him against the violence of a veteran soldier who had almost killed him in a quarrel about his land. How far more precise and convincing is this than the statement of Martial¹, that Maecenas restored his farm to Vergil: a fact completely disproved, if by nothing else, by the internal evidence which the Eclogues themselves supply.

No doubt it would require strong interest to induce Octavianus to restore Vergil's land. Octavianus, who was seven years younger than Vergil, probably knew little or nothing

¹ 8. 56. 7: 'Iugera perdiderat miseræ vicina Cremonae
Flebat et abductas Tityrus aeger oves;
Risit Tuscus eques, paupertatemque malignam
Reppulit, et celeri iussit abire fuga.'

of him at this time, and according to both Dio and Appian he was unwilling enough to give any offence to the veterans by restoring confiscated estates. Dio mentions however that he was at length forced by the general outcry to exempt the lands of senators, the dowries of married women, and those estates which were too small for more than one man to cultivate; but even these he was again forced, almost at the peril of his life, to restore to the soldiers. These and other expressions in Dio and Appian would fit Vergil's case, however we conceive it. But I doubt whether the evidence afforded by the *Eclogues* themselves and by Suetonius (and the other evidence we have seen to be confused and inconsistent) warrants our assuming more than this; that Vergil was ejected with violence and at the peril of his life from his farm, after having been under the impression that he was to keep it; that in his trouble he was assisted by Maecenas; that he addressed Alfenus Varus on the subject in the ninth *Eclogue*, and probably also in plain prose; that he then went to Rome, where, backed by the influence of Varus and Pollio and Gallus, he obtained from Octavianus the restitution of his estate.

The violence offered to Vergil, mentioned both in the ninth *Eclogue* and in the memoirs of Probus and Suetonius, is explained by Probus in his commentary as due to the irritation felt by the veterans at the restitution of the farm; Suetonius speaks generally of a quarrel in which Vergil was roughly handled. But there is nothing in all this to shew that the ninth *Eclogue* was written subsequently to the first. Vergil may have suffered violence, as he says in the ninth *Eclogue*, on his ejection; he may have suffered it again on his restitution; but this does not prove that he made two journeys to Rome, or was twice restored by Octavianus.

I see no reason for supposing that Vergil was not restored to his own farm in the neighbourhood of Mantua, though, as he was afterwards fond of living in Campania, it is probable enough that he had a country house near Naples, perhaps given him, as the Sabine farm was to Horace, by one of his powerful friends.

Propertius and Tibullus suffered in these confiscations as well as Vergil (*Prop.* 5. 1. 125 foll., *Tibull.* 4. 1. 183). Propertius

says that not long after this event (*mox*) he took his *toga virilis*; supposing him to have been fourteen at the time, his birth should be placed about 55 B.C., and not in 49 or thereabouts, as Teuffel suggests in his History of Roman Literature. The earlier date would also suit other passages in his poems. The two last poems of his first book contain a vivid allusion to the war of Perugia of B.C. 41: supposing them to have been written near the events referred to, Propertius must, if he were born in 49, have been a poet when he was eight years old. But supposing him to have been fourteen or fifteen at the time of the *bellum Perusinum*, these poems may be taken as specimens of his early writing; for he began poetry, as he himself tells us, at the time of his taking the *toga virilis*. I would observe further that the date 56 or 55 B.C. would tally with the language of 4. 11, written not earlier than 29 B.C. and probably not long after, in which he speaks of his *iuvēnta* as passed. This would be an expression natural for a sensitive poet of twenty-seven or twenty-eight, but not for a youth of twenty or twenty-one.

If the Varus of the sixth Eclogue be, as he almost certainly is, the Alfenus Varus mentioned above, this poem, inscribed with his name, may be assigned to this period. The Eclogue is remarkable mainly for the beautiful song of Silenus, the earliest extant piece in which any sign appears of Vergil's philosophical studies. It shews that for the purpose of poetry Vergil had attained a sufficient mastery of philosophical language; and some lines give evidence of the careful study of Lucretius which would no doubt be encouraged in the school of Siron, and of which the traces are so marked in the Georgics and the Aeneid.

Suetonius and Probus (?) inform us that the Eclogues as finally published by Vergil were intended as a compliment to Alfenus Varus, Asinius Pollio, and Cornelius Gallus. These are the *tres amici* of the Berne scholia on Ecl. 1. Of Alfenus Varus we have already spoken; Gallus is the hero of the tenth Eclogue; the fourth and the eighth were written in honour of Pollio. I admit that the meaning of the fourth Eclogue cannot, with our present *data*, be ascertained with certainty; yet when the events of the year 40 B.C. are considered, I think that it is not impossible to arrive at a probable explanation of it. In this year peace was concluded at Brundisium between Antonius and

Octavianus, and Asinius Pollio was one of the consuls. I am quite unable to understand the reasons which have induced some recent German critics to eliminate the mention of Pollio from this Eclogue; a proceeding which cannot, as it seems to me, be defended on any grounds either of history or criticism. For the most natural interpretation of the poem (a birthday ode) would seem to be that which refers it to the child expected from the marriage of Octavianus with Scribonia. At least there seems nothing to hinder such an explanation; while to refer it to the child of Pollio is difficult, considering the circumstances of the year. Civil war was apparently put an end to by the peace of Brundisium, which had been brought about, in great part, by Pollio. The mere advent of peace in those times would be sufficient to suggest to an enthusiastic poet a dream of the golden age returning. The coming child, says Vergil, is to rule the world with the manly virtues of his father; he is the offspring of gods, and another Jove is to grow from him; of whom could the poet say this but of the offspring of the Caesars? Antonius was indeed, with Octavianus, master of the Roman world; but any such reference to him on Vergil's part is out of the question. The honours of the poem must, it would appear in any case, be divided between Pollio and Octavianus. This was perceived by the critic in Macrobius, 3. 7. 1, whose remarks are worth quoting at length. *Cum loqueretur de filio Pollionis, id quod ad principem suum spectaret, adiecit;*

Ipse sed in pratis aries iam suave rubenti

Murice, iam croceo mutabit vellera luto.

Traditur autem in libris Etruscorum, si hoc animal insolito colore fuerit inductum, portendi imperatori rerum omnium felicitatem. Est super hoc liber Tarquittii transcriptus ex Ostentario Tusco. Ibi reperitur: 'purpureo aureove colore ovis ariesve si aspergetur, principi ordinis et generis summa cum felicitate largitatem auget, genus progeniem propagat in claritate laetiooremque efficit.' Huiusmodi igitur statum in transitu vaticinatur. The Berne scholia also mention critics who took the poem as alluding to Octavianus. I am aware that Servius as well as Macrobius (if indeed both names do not rather represent the same comment) apply this poem to the child of Pollio, and that among modern critics Ribbeck and Sellar have taken the same view. Yet I find it

difficult to imagine that in face of the circumstances of the time and the present power of the triumvirs Vergil would have ventured to point to the offspring of Asinius Pollio as destined to govern and regenerate the Roman world, even if, in any case, his language could have been applied to the family of the Asinii without gross exaggeration. But a child of the Julian *gens* might fairly be called *deum suboles*; Iulus in the ninth Aeneid is *dis genite et geniture deos*: even Julius Caesar was not free from the vanity of tracing his descent from Venus; and I incline therefore to refer this Eclogue to the expected child of Octavianus and Scribonia, and to compare its language with the verses in the sixth Aeneid (729 foll.) where Augustus is spoken of as the restorer of the golden age.

The eighth Eclogue must apparently be assigned to the time of Pollio's expedition against the Parthini, B.C. 40. It will then precede by a year or thereabouts the first ode of Horace's second book. As often, so here these twin poets express themselves in nearly identical language; *grande munus Cecropio repetes cothurno*; *sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna cothurno*.

I have attempted so far to deal with some of the main difficulties presented by the Eclogues; whether successfully or not I must leave it to other scholars to decide. As to the time which their composition occupied, we are met with an apparent conflict between the statement of Suetonius and the internal evidence offered by the poems themselves. Suetonius says that the Eclogues were written in three years; Probus, if it be Probus, that he wrote them, i.e. I suppose, began them, in his twenty-ninth year: and they may, as we have seen, have been begun as early as B.C. 43 or 42. In spite of Ribbeck's opinion to the contrary, I am inclined to think those scholars were in the right who assigned the tenth Eclogue, with its allusion to the cold Rhine, to the year 37, when that river was crossed by Agrippa. Thus instead of the three years of Suetonius we get five or six. I would suggest, as a means of getting over this difficulty, that Suetonius, or the authority whom he followed, probably took the Eclogues as they stood in the order of publication, and noticing that the date of the first was about 40 and that of the last about 37 B.C., jumped to the conclusion that the whole work was composed in that period, forgetting that, like Horace's Odes

and Epodes, the Eclogues are a collection of poems written in different years, and arranged not chronologically, but in an order intended to gratify the poet's friends. For it is clear that the first Eclogue owes its place to its subject, and is intended as an acknowledgment of the generosity of Octavianus.

No certain date can be assigned either to the second, third, fifth, or sixth Eclogues; the seventh cannot be dated at all. But the seventh Eclogue raises a question of great interest, first suggested to me by Mr. Munro in an article on Propertius in the *Journal of Philology*, as to the place at which it and perhaps others among the Eclogues were composed. Propertius says of Vergil (3. 26. 67), *Tu canis umbrosi subter pineta Galaesi Thyrsin et attritis Daphnin arundinibus*, implying that the Thyrsis and Daphnis of his brother poet belonged to the neighbourhood not of Mantua but of Tarentum. That Vergil was once at Tarentum, and at a time which would fairly coincide with that of the composition of the Eclogues, is proved by a passage in the fourth Georgic (125), *namque sub Oebaliae memini me moenibus altis . . . Corycium vidisse senem*. If the Georgics were published in 29 B.C. Vergil might fairly speak of a 'memory' of some ten or twelve years before. Mr. Munro remarks that the scenery about Tarentum suits the description of scenery in the Eclogues, which the neighbourhood of Mantua notoriously does not; and I have endeavoured since reading his article to find other evidence in confirmation of the view which he suggests. Not much, I must admit, is forthcoming; but it is worth noticing, I think, that in the second Georgic (197) Vergil mentions the country about Tarentum in the same breath with that of Mantua, as if both were equally familiar to him: *Saltus et saturi petito longinqua Tarenti, Et qualem infelix amisit Mantua campum, Pascentem niveos herboso flumine cygnos*. Vergil's intimacy with Horace, and Horace's well-known fondness for Tarentum (Od. 2. 6. 9, *Dulce pellitis ovibus Galaesi Flumen et regnata petam Iaconi Rura Phalantho*; 3. 16. 33, *Calabrae apes*; 1. 31. 5, *aestuosae grata Calabriae Armenta*; Epist. 1. 16. 11, *dicas adductum propius frondere Tarentum*) suggest the possibility that the two poets may at some time have been at Tarentum together.

The ten Eclogues as we have them would appear from their title to be a selection from a larger number. In the ninth a

number of verses are quoted which profess to come from another unfinished poem, and it is quite possible that Vergil wrote others which he never published. Perhaps the round number ten points in the same direction.

The success of the Eclogues at the time of their publication was so great that they were often recited in the theatre, where Vergil, if we may believe Tacitus, was received with honours equal to those paid to Augustus himself. Whether they were performed as dramatic pieces with scenic accompaniment, or as simple poems, we do not know. Modern criticism dwells readily on the artificiality of their construction. It would seem as if at this period Vergil must have been in love with allegory; so little is stated plainly, so much has to be discerned through a mist of serious or playful suggestion. The names are often Greek: the very descriptions of scenery are in many cases taken from Theocritus, and, when transferred from Sicily to the country about Mantua, entirely conventional and misleading. Yet how much real beauty is there in Vergil's Eclogues! To say nothing of the lovely rhythm of his verse, evidently perfected with so much devotion and labour, what a sense is there of the charm of nature, of the beautiful fancies of the Greek mythology, of the inestimable value of philosophical culture! in his very devotion to Theocritus, what a genuine love of one of the most refreshing of Greek poets! and everywhere what a light and playful hand, what a sure poetic touch! The Eclogues (and here is the best proof of Vergil's original genius) charm us in spite of the strangeness of their form, which cannot silence the voice of the harmonious mind speaking in those musical accents.

It must always be remembered, also, that Vergil, though reproducing in the Eclogues the form of the *idyllion* of Theocritus, did so for the first time, and with a peculiarity of style to a great extent his own. In the hands of Theocritus the *idyllion* or picture of country life is, on the whole, what it professes to be; but Vergil makes the form of the pastoral poem serve as a framework for allusion to his own times and circumstances. In the idyll proper, shepherds talk to one another of their loves and their flocks; but the poet as well as the shepherd is, in his way, the votary of Nature, who loves to haunt mountains and rivers and forests; and thus, as the form of the idyll developed itself, the

poet and the shepherd came to be identified. Bion in Moschus' lovely poem is called a shepherd, and most of all in Vergil's eclogue the shepherd speaks not only in his own person but in that of the poet, and the names of his companions are chosen to denote well-known persons in whom the interest of the poet and his readers happen to centre. This form of composition could, it is plain, be attempted successfully only by a master-hand. It has its inconveniences, it lays itself open readily to the attacks of criticism; but it must not be forgotten that it is mainly Vergil to whose genius English literature owes the *Lycidas* and the *Thyrsis*.

The acquaintance of Vergil with Horace must have begun before the publication of the *Eclogues*. For it was probably in B.C. 37, the year when the last *Eclogue* was composed, that Vergil with Varius and Tucca, the future editors of his *Aeneid*, joined Horace at Sinuessa on their journey to Brundisium. Horace speaks of Vergil as at that time one of his most intimate friends (*Sat.* 1. 5. 40), as if the acquaintance were now of long standing. We have nothing here but faint indications to guide us: still it is worth while to put together such fragments of evidence as exist. Horace, like Vergil, was for some time an Epicurean: witness the third satire of the first book, and the ode (1. 34) *Parvus Deorum cultor*. Had he learned his philosophy, like Vergil, in the school of Siron? The only relic, as far as I know, of the early stages of friendship between the two poets is the twelfth ode of the fourth book, which, in spite of the fact that this book was published after Vergil's death, I am disposed to think refers to our Vergil. The ode, which Horace perhaps had not cared to publish before, is addressed to a Vergilius whom Horace asks to dinner on condition of his bringing with him a box of nard in exchange for Horace's wine. The language of the poem would very well suit the time when both poets were young and Horace poor, and before his introduction by Vergil, the *iuvenum nobilium cliens*, to the circle of Maecenas.

The wealthy and accomplished Etruscan *eques*, C. Cilnius Maecenas, had, as we have seen, aided Vergil, who was at that time but slightly known to him, in resisting the violence of a veteran soldier in the quarrel arising from the confiscation of

the poet's estate. Maecenas, himself something of a poet, and the generous friend and patron of several men of letters, probably introduced Vergil to the nearer friendship of Octavianus. In his honour Vergil undertook the composition of his second great work, the Georgics, on which we are told by Suetonius and can well believe that he was occupied seven years.

There is really no evidence to shew when Vergil began the composition of the Georgics. For the line at the end of the first (509), *hic movet Euphrates, illic Germania bellum*, which has usually been relied upon as referring to the events of 37 B.C., refers rather, as I hope to shew below, to those of the year 33 or 32. Indeed the whole question of the composition and editions of the Georgics is one of great difficulty. They were read to Octavianus by Vergil and Maecenas in turn in the year 29, when he finally returned to Italy after his settlement of the East. Suetonius says, *Georgica post Actiacam victoriam Augusto atque Atellae reficiendarum faucium causa commoranti per continuum quadriduum legit, suscipiente Maecenate legendi vicem*. This statement, as Heyne reminds us, cannot be taken as literally true, for Augustus, though he returned to Italy after the battle of Actium in the winter of 31, only stayed a month at Brundisium settling matters with his veterans. The year 30 he spent partly in composing the affairs of Parthia by restoring Phraates to his throne (*Horace*, *Od.* 2. 2. 16, *redditum Cyri solio Phraaten Dissidens plebi numero beatorum Eximit virtus*; *Dio*, 51. 18). We must suppose therefore that the words *post Actiacam victoriam* are merely a general expression.

The year 29 therefore is the *terminus ad quem* of the composition of the Georgics: that is, of the first edition of them; for the original conclusion of the fourth was, we are distinctly informed by Servius, an episode on Vergil's friend and fellow-poet Cornelius Gallus, whose fall and suicide took place in B.C. 26. The episode of Aristaeus was substituted for the original conclusion at the desire of Augustus; a fact hardly creditable to Vergil's courage or fidelity to an old friend. The only *terminus a quo* is, as far as I am aware, the mention of the *portus Iulius* made by Agrippa in 37 (G. 2. 161.) For the rest, we are left in this question mainly to internal evidence, and that not of a very decisive or satisfactory kind. I will

state however the conclusions at which I have finally arrived after a repeated consideration of the various points which claim attention.

I would first observe that some passages in the Georgics may, in my opinion, have been originally written by Vergil independently of the context in which they now stand. I would note in particular the conclusion of the first Georgic on the death of Caesar; the lines in the second where Vergil speaks of the happiness of the peasant's life, and of his own longings for a knowledge of philosophy and science,—a passage of which there is an inferior draft or copy in the *Culex*; the introductions to the first and third Georgics, which can hardly have been written before the year 29, in which Octavianus celebrated his triple triumph. Very probably the same is the case with the episode of Aristaeus of which I have already spoken.

Part of the first, second, and third Georgics was probably written from 31 to 29 B.C. *Haec super arborum cultu pecorumque canebam Et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum Fulminat Euphraten bello, victorque volentes Per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympto*, says Vergil in verses now placed, not after the third Georgic as might be expected, but after the fourth, although they contain no mention of bees. These lines must surely refer to the settlement of Eastern affairs by Octavianus after the battle of Actium. But there are passages in the Georgics which both from the actual historical allusions which they contain and from their general tone must be placed earlier than this. Much difficulty has been occasioned by the conclusion of the first book. Vergil, after describing in immortal lines the thrill of horror which passed through Italy at the assassination of Julius Caesar, proceeds to say that not only was all nature moved at the dreadful deed, but that the gods exacted a more awful vengeance; for Roman again met Roman in deadly strife at Philippi, and Emathia and the plains of Haemus were again fattened with Roman blood. The time was out of joint; the only hope lay with the gods, that they would not hinder the young Caesar from bringing aid; the land was desolated with war and crime, the plough was held in no honour, the fields lay untended and there was none to till them, the pruning-hook was beaten out into the blade of a sword. On this

side the Euphrates, on the other side Germany was stirring up war; city was arming against city, the demons of strife were abroad, and there was none to check or hinder them.

The lines describing the immediate consequences of Caesar's murder may, as I have said, have been written independently and afterwards inserted in their present position; the verses about Philippi, too, have the air of a recent allusion, and may have been originally composed soon after the battle; but the passage beginning *Di patrii indigetes*, which immediately follows them, must, I think, have been written at the end of 33 or the beginning of 32 B.C., at the commencement of the civil war which ended at Actium. This passage is full of melancholy forebodings, and nothing can be more explicit than the words *vicinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes Arma ferunt, saevit toto Mars impius orbe*, the exact allusion in which is not, I think, rightly caught by Ribbeck in his *Prolegomena*. *Mars impius* must mean civil war: *vicinae urbes* cannot well refer to any but the neighbour cities of Italy. Now with regard to Italy, Dio (50. 6) says, in speaking of the events of 32 B.C., Καίσαρι μὲν ἢ τε Ἰταλία συνήρατο, πάντας γὰρ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου ἀποικισθέντας, τὰ μὲν ἐκφοβήσας ἅτε ὀλίγους ὄντας, τὰ δὲ καὶ εὐεργετήσας, προσετίθετο, τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς τὴν Βονωνίαν ἐποικοῦντας αὐτὸς αὖθις, ἵνα δὴ καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀπάρκισθαι δοκῶσι, προσκατεστήσατο. These words clearly imply that there were cities in Italy which favoured Antonius, and that Octavianus had some trouble in crushing or disarming their opposition. There must have been a time, probably towards the end of 33 or beginning of 32 B.C., when their hostility to him and to the cities which took his side was making itself felt, and Vergil's lines may well apply to this very time. It is important to remember that about this time Phraates, on Antonius withdrawing his forces from the frontier, overran Media and Armenia. To this raid I am inclined to refer the words *hic movet Euphrates bellum*; for soon after this, probably owing to their internal troubles, the Parthians were quiet (ὁ Πάρθος οὐδὲν παρεκίνει, Dio, 50. 1).

The allusion to Germany is not cleared up by any explicit statement in the historical books. But, as Ribbeck has observed in his *Prolegomena*, Dio (51. 21), when describing the triple triumph of Augustus in 29 B.C., mentions that C. Carrinas was

allowed a triumph for his victories over the Morini, whom he had crushed, and the Suevi, whom he had driven over the Rhine. The Romans were vague in their use of the name Suevi, which Vergil might easily render by *Germania*. This triumph of Carrinas is distinctly alluded to in the eighth Aeneid (727), *extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis*. Though no exact date is assigned to the victory of Carrinas over the Suevi, it is reasonable to suppose that it took place after the German campaign of Agrippa in 36, and at a period not very far distant from the triumphs of 29 B.C.; otherwise it would hardly have been commemorated in that celebration. As to the war itself, Dio expressly implies that it was aggressive on the part of the Suevi, defensive on the part of the Romans: τοὺς Σουήβους τὸν Ῥῆνον ἐπὶ πολέμῳ διαβάντας ἀπέωσατο. *Movere bellum* is the natural expression for an offensive war (Livy, 43. 1. 11, *ne bellum cum ulla gente moveat*), and as it will perfectly well apply to the attacks of Phraates in the East, there seems no reason to doubt that it may refer equally well to the movements of the Suevi on the Rhine, which I suppose to have taken place between 33 and 31 B.C., and perhaps to have been occasioned by the outbreak of the civil war; for the civil dissensions of the Romans were always the opportunity of their foreign enemies. Compare Propertius, 4. 3 (2). 45, *Barbarus aut Suevo perfusus sanguine Rhenus Saucia maerenti corpora vectet aqua*; lines which may indeed refer to the former wars against the Suevi, but will equally well apply to their repulse by Carrinas; indeed they seem to imply an unsuccessful combat on a river side.

The end of the first Georgic is therefore best referred to the period immediately preceding the civil war which ended at Actium, the end of 33 or the beginning of 32 B.C. Octavianus is not spoken of as victorious, but prayed for as the only hope of his falling country. The words *iam pridem caeli nobis te regia, Caesar, Invidet, atque hominum queritur curare triumphos* need not, I think, be pressed too literally, as if they could only refer to the actual *triumphi* of B.C. 29. Vergil means that the world is grown too wicked for a god to dwell in; the gods have turned their eyes away from Rome, and are jealous at thinking that one of themselves can trouble himself about any honours of victory which men can offer him.

Thus interpreted, the whole passage is in striking accord with the second ode of Horace's first book. The sense of this poem plainly is that Rome is suffering for the sins of her children, and Horace, like Vergil, but less directly and in allegorical language, expresses the same hope, but not more than the same hope, that Octavianus may prove the saviour of his country. Roman citizens have sharpened against each other's breasts the sword by which the Parthians ought to have perished: what god can we call upon amid the ruins of the falling empire? Vesta will hardly listen to the prayers of her virgins; perhaps Apollo or Venus or Mars or the son of Maia, in guise of the young Caesar, the avenger of his father's murder, may take pity on us. May Caesar still deign to remain among men and think still of earthly triumphs, accepting the names of father and *princeps*, and not suffering the Medes to ride unavenged.

The last two stanzas correspond remarkably with Vergil's words, *iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar, Invidet, atque hominum queritur curare triumphos*; while the tone of the whole poem, and especially the words about the Medes in the last two lines, is doubtful and apprehensive, and makes it difficult if not impossible to suppose that it was written after the settlement of the Eastern difficulties by Octavianus in B.C. 30.

To about the same period it would seem also reasonable to assign the seventh epode of Horace, *Quo quo scelesti ruitis*, and the seventeenth, *altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas*, though it is to be observed that in these poems there is no allusion of any kind to Octavianus, and it is therefore not impossible that they were written before the battle of Philippi, while Horace was still a republican. In any case we must be struck by the similarity of their language and spirit to those of Vergil. This is, if possible, still more remarkable in the concluding stanzas of the first ode in the second book (though written, perhaps, six years before), *Quis non Latino sanguine pinguior Campus sepulcris impia proelia Testatur, auditumque Medis Hesperiae sonitum ruinae?* Listen to Vergil in the first Georgic (491), *Nec fuit indignum superis, bis sanguine nostro Emathiam et latos Haemi pinguescere campos*.

Reminiscences of this troublous time recur in the second Georgic. At least it is difficult to assign to any other period

the line (497), *aut coniurato descendens Dacus ab Istro*, which, if the word *coniurato* is to bear its full meaning, must surely allude to the support given by the Dacians to Antonius in his last struggle (Dio, 51. 22). The rest of the passage, though Vergil seems to have expressed himself almost studiously in general language, will very well fit the circumstances of the same years. Parts of it may indeed, I think, be taken as containing a covert attack on Antonius and his party. I would call particular attention to the words, *illum . . . non purpura regum Flexit; ruuntque In ferrum, penetrant aulas et limina regum*, which are best explained as alluding to intrigues with Oriental courts such as Antonius had been carrying on with Media and Armenia and Egypt; *res Romanae perituraque regna* must mean the fortunes of Rome, and the falling Eastern despotisms opposed to her; *infidos agitans discordia fratres*, if the words have a special reference at all, may be meant either for Phraates the murderer of his brother, or for the Armenian princes Artaxias and Tigranes; and the lines *hic petit excidiis Urbem patriosque Penates, Ut gemma bibat et Sarrano dormiat ostro*, might be very well applied to Antonius himself. *Ferrea iura* I am inclined to explain as meaning shameless, or ruthless, decisions in the Roman courts of law. This meaning of *iura* I have illustrated in the latest number of the *Journal of Philology*; for *ferreus* in the sense of shameless we may compare the words of the orator Licinius Crassus, quoted by Suetonius (Nero, 4), *cui os ferreum, cor plumbeum esset*, Cicero in Pisonem, § 63, *os tuum ferreum senatus convicio verberari*, Catullus, 42. 17, *ferreo canis exprimamus ore*; in Quintilian (?), Declam. 3. 10. 8, *ferrea iura factorum* means the inexorable decrees of fate.

The lines 171-2, *te maxime Caesar, Qui nunc extremis Asiae iam victor in oris Imbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum*, refer to the settlement of the East by Octavianus after the battle of Actium, 31 B.C. Of this Dio, 51. 18, says: *ἐς τε τὴν Ἀσίαν τὸ ἔθνος διὰ τῆς Συρίας ἦλθε κἀνταῦθα παρεχέμασε, τὰ τε τῶν ὑπηκόων καὶ τὰ τῶν Πάρθων ἅμα καθιστάμενος*. Compare Georgic 3. 30, *urbes Asiae domitas*, and 4. 561, *victorque volentes Per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo*.

I now come to the introductions to the first and third Georgics, which I am inclined to think were composed immediately before

and with a view to the recitation of 29 B.C. The years 30 and 29 were signalised by the granting of all kinds of public honours to Octavianus. In particular we are told by Dio (l. c. 20) that after the news about the settlement of the Parthian affairs arrived, it was decreed that the name of Octavianus should be mentioned in the public forms of religious service (ἐς τοὺς ὕμνους — ἐξ Ἰσου τοῖς θεοῖς ἐσγράφεσθαι), and that a number of other religious ceremonies were inaugurated in his honour. For these, as Vergil says at the end of the fourth Georgic, he had been, since Actium, winning his way: *viamque adfectat Olympo*. The address to Octavianus as a deity at the beginning of the first Georgic must, I think, be taken as a poetical expression of the public feeling at this time. Its tone is so entirely different from that of the concluding lines of the poem that it is impossible to suppose that the two passages can have been written in the same year; Octavianus is welcomed as a present deity, and there is no mention of the wrath of Heaven or of gloomy forebodings. Ribbeck with Franke refers this passage to the summer of the year 36, when Sextus Pompeius had been conquered and peace apparently restored. In this year, it is true, many honours were voted to Octavianus at Rome, and in some Italian cities he was enrolled among the gods: αἱ πόλεις τοῖς σφετέροις θεοῖς συνίδρουν, Appian, 5. 132. But I doubt whether this fact corresponds adequately with the general tone of the introduction to the first Georgic. The opening of the third Georgic may also, I think, be more fitly assigned to the year 29 than to any other. It was a year of general holiday (Dio, 51. 21), and Vergil's tone is one of unmixed joy and exultation. *Pugnam Gangaridum . . . victorisque arma Quirini* the commentators refer rightly to the defeat of Antonius with his Eastern following: *navali surgentes aere columnas* is illustrated by the decree of the senate (B.C. 30), τὴν κρηπίδα τοῦ Ἰουλιείου ἡρώου τοῖς τῶν αἰχμαλωτῶν νεῶν ἐμβόλοις κοσμηθῆναι: *urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten* refers to the settlement of the difficulties with Armenia, which had been in arms against the Romans five years before. The lines, *et duo rapta manu diverso ex hoste tropaea, Bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentes*, have caused much difficulty: but it seems quite possible to refer them to the Morini and the Dalmatians. The Morini had been twice conquered, once by Julius Caesar, and

later again by Gaius Carrinas : the Dalmatians had been subdued by Vatinius, who received a *supplicatio* on this account in the year 45, and again by Octavianus himself in B.C. 34. Both the Morini and the Dalmatians appeared in the triple triumph of 29. Propertius, 4. 8 (9). 53, alludes in similar language to the same events : *Prosequar et currus utroque ab litore oantes*.

To this passage, too, Horace offers us a companion poem : I mean the ninth ode of the second book : *et potius nova Cantemus Augusti tropaea Caesaris, et rigidum Niphaten, Medumque flumen gentibus additum Victis minores volvere vortices*.

I am tempted here to raise a further question about the opening of the third Georgic. Vergil speaks as if he were thinking of a journey from Greece back to Italy; but this idea he turns at once into a metaphor, saying that he will bring back the Muses with him and set up a temple on the banks of the Mincio, where all the athletes of Greece shall, for the pleasure of Caesar, exhibit their rival excellence. Was Vergil really in Greece when he wrote this passage? Horace has an ode (the fourth of the first book) inscribed to a Vergilius, described as starting on a journey for Athens, whom he calls the other half of his soul. It is very difficult to suppose that Vergilius is not the poet; that Horace had two intimate friends of this name is possible, but hardly probable. The only journey of Vergil's into Greece which is mentioned by Suetonius is indeed his last one, undertaken in the year 19 : that Horace can be referring to this in the first book of his odes is a chronological impossibility. I think therefore that it is worth while to raise the question whether Vergil did not, shortly before writing the beginning of the third Georgic, travel to Greece, and whether a record of this journey is not preserved in Horace's well-known ode.

The three first Georgics were, according to the poet's own statement, written at or in the neighbourhood of Naples. The statement of Suetonius, that the composition of the whole work occupied Vergil seven years, is fully borne out by the elaboration of their style, nor, as we have seen, is it contradicted by the scanty historical allusions which help us to fix their date by internal evidence. The earliest of these allusions is to the *portus Iulius* of Agrippa made in 37 B.C., the latest is to the triumphs of 29. Supposing Vergil to have set to work upon

the Georgics in 36, we get an interval of seven years for their composition; the very time mentioned by Suetonius.

The Georgics give evidence of a far riper growth of Vergil's mind than the Eclogues; they afford also a more striking testimony to the real originality and independence of his genius. In the Eclogues Vergil is to a great extent the pupil of Theocritus; of the Greek authorities whom he follows in the Georgics, Aratus, Nicander, even Hesiod, he is in a poetical sense the master. The common characteristic of the Greek didactic poems, so far as their remains enable us to judge, is a simplicity not without a flavour of its own, but still prosaic. The phraseology of the great Greek epics is indeed employed, but there is little of conscious poetical inspiration; the words follow the ideas, and the ideas do not often rise above a comparatively ordinary level. Turning to Vergil, what a change do we find! It is not the details which make his poetry or determine its spirit; it is he who finds out and masters the details, informing them with the breath of poetry. Few, if any, didactic poets have equalled, and none have surpassed Vergil in this power of throwing a poetical colour over the details of an unpoetical subject. An extraordinary mixture of learning with originality meets us on every page; line upon line is a monument of living, creative study. Nor is it Greek masters only to whom Vergil has had recourse; he has made a profound study of Lucretius, and is in fact full of the spirit of philosophical speculation, as this was understood in his age and country. The poetical side of the Epicurean philosophy, as it had wholly absorbed the passionate soul of Lucretius, exercised in like manner its powerful spell over the mind of Vergil, though at the time of the composition of the Georgics he had emancipated himself from its exclusive influence. In the first Georgic he accounts for the movements of the birds by an Epicurean explanation; in the fourth he shews signs of being attracted by Platonism, which seems afterwards to have gained a permanent hold upon his mind.

Traces of the study of Lucretius meet us on almost every page of the Georgics. His influence over Vergil was natural enough, as he died at the time when the latter was just growing out of boyhood, and would thus be most susceptible to poetical

ideas. The teaching of Siron would doubtless deepen the impression. The attitude of Vergil towards nature is, however, different from that of Lucretius. Inclined as he evidently was towards the system of Epicurus at the time when the first three Georgics were written, he never committed himself to any philosophical dogma which could narrow the range of his sympathies. Vergil never brings himself to give up the details of his familiar mythology; the beings who haunt the rivers, fields, and rocks, the kindly friends of the husbandman, whom Greek and Roman had worshipped for generations and whom poet and husbandman alike had hailed and honoured as their friends, the husbandman as his companions and protectors, the poet because they suggested to him a thousand memories of fancy and beauty. So in the Georgics a poetical colouring is given to the primitive worship of nature on which Greek and Roman religion was alike based; to Vergil the country is the abode of Pan, Ceres, and the Nymphs, and every implement, every process of cultivation, has its tutelary deity. For all this there was no place in the system of Epicurus, in which the gods are represented as taking no part in the direction of human affairs. And thus Lucretius' deep love of nature is untouched by any associations of fable or mythological fancy; it is the pure passion, the clear unthwarted vision of the philosophic poet. Vergil's mind was too susceptible to the manifold impressions of mythology and literature to bind itself by a theory which banished the ancient gods from human life and from the imagination of the poet. His study of Lucretius is thus only in part sympathetic; with all Vergil's devotion to his master, there are many traces of a tacit protest against the rigour of his doctrine and method.

The Georgics are, again, not without their value as illustrating the politics and history of Vergil's time. Few things in literature, for instance, give a deeper sense than the end of the first Georgic of the horror and passion which convulsed Italy at the assassination of Julius Caesar. To the floating rumours which gathered in an atmosphere full of wild excitement and imaginative superstition, Vergil has given poetical form and coherence. With him it is all nature that mourns the death of a hero; the sun hides his lustrous head

in a veil of darkness, and the godless generations fear the coming of eternal night. A terrible vengeance is exacted by Heaven in the civil wars which desolated the world. It must not be supposed that this notion of a Providence avenging Caesar's death was a mere poetic fancy. It was more probably a fanatical conviction alive in the breasts of all, high and low alike, who had venerated the great dictator as the saviour of his country. No doubt it took various forms in different minds: Vergil speaks as a poet; the stern words of Suetonius (Iulius, 89) present another aspect of the same idea: *percussorum autem neque triennio quisquam amplius supervixit, neque sua morte defunctus est. Dammati omnes alius alio casu periit, pars naufragio, pars proelio; nonnulli semet eodem illo pugione quo Caesarem violaverant, interemerunt.* And it may be said in general that the corruption and desolation of the time, the breaking up of moral and social ties consequent on the revolutions and civil wars of a century, which had struck deep sorrow into all the most patriotic minds in Italy, is commemorated by the melancholy verses of Vergil and Horace as vividly as by any historian. Yet Vergil speaks as a poet, not as a preacher: whether the Georgics have any direct ethical purpose may well, I think, be doubted.

It will be not without interest, now that we have arrived at this point in Vergil's career, to notice a few passages which, in addition to those already quoted, may be taken as evidence of the intimate friendship between him and Horace. Horace's judgment of Vergil is well known—*molle atque facetum (epos) Vergilio annuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae*, the Muses have granted him tenderness and refined wit in his hexameter writing. It must be remembered that these words can only be referred to the Eclogues, for the tenth satire of the first book is not dated by any critic, so far as I know, later than 32 B.C. But there are lines in the Epodes and in the two books of the Satires which so closely resemble passages in the Georgics as well as in the Eclogues, as to suggest either direct imitation of the one poet by the other, or, which I think more probable, constant and intimate communication between the two friends, who would no doubt see much of each other's work while in progress and before publication. To use a friend's verses seems to have been regarded by the Roman poets as a compliment and a mark of

affection. The second Epode is a playful treatment of the theme to which Vergil has devoted his beautiful lines (513 foll.) at the end of the second Georgic; the sixteenth, both in subject and treatment, suggests a memory of the fourth Eclogue, especially when Horace's lines *non huc Argoo contendit remige pinus* are compared with Vergil's *nec nautica pinus Mutabit merces*. In the eleventh Epode (line 6) *silvis honorem decutit* recalls *frigidus et silvis Aquilo decussit honorem* (Georg. 2. 404); compare further Sat. 1. 1. 36, *simul inversum contristat Aquarius annum*, with Georg. 3. 279, *pluvio contristat frigore caelum*; Sat. 1. 1. 114, *ut cum carceribus missos rapit ungula currus*, with Georg. 1. 512, *ut cum carceribus sese effudere quadrigae, Fertur equis auriga*; Sat. 1. 2. 89, *breve quod caput, ardua cervix*, with Georg. 3. 79, *ardua cervix Argutumque caput*; Sat. 2. 2. 93, *tellus me prima tulisset*, with Georg. 1. 12, *cui prima frementem Fudit ecum magno tellus percussa tridenti*; Sat. 2. 6. 91, *praerupti nemoris patientem vivere dorso*, with Georg. 3. 436, *dorso nemoris...iacuisse per herbas*.

Vergil's friendship with Varius is attested in the same way. The critic in Macrobius, 6. 1. 39, points out that Vergil owed to his friend's poem, *De Morte Caesaris*, Georg. 2. 506, *ut gemma bibat et Sarrano dormiat ostro*, and Ecl. 8. 85, *talis amor Daphnin, qualis cum fessa iuvenum Per nemora atque altos quaerendo bucula lucos Propter aquae rivum viridi procumbit in ulva Perdita, nec serae meminit decedere nocti*; Varius having written *incubet et Tyriis atque ex solido bibat auro*; *Ceu canis umbrosam lustrans Gortynia vallem, Si veteris potuit cervae deprendere lustra, Saevit in absentem, et circum vestigia lustrans Aethera per nitidum tenues sectatur odores*; *Non amnes illam medii, non flumina tardant; Perdita nec serae meminit decedere nocti*; a passage which has been turned to account by Vergil more than once.

That Propertius knew and admired the Georgics is proved not only by the well-known passage about them in the last elegy of his third book, but by a remarkable passage in the fifth poem of his fourth book (v. 25 foll.): *Tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores, Quis deus hanc mundi temperet arte domum, Qua venit exorians, qua deficit, unde coactis Cornibus in plenum menstrua luna redit, Unde salo superant venti, quid flamine captet Eurys, et in nubes unde perennis aqua, Sit ventura dies, mundi quae subruat arces, Purpureus pluvias cur bibat arcus aquas, Aut cur Perrhaebi*

tremuere cacumina Pindi, Solis et atratis luxerit orbis equis; Cur serus versare boves et plaustra Bootes, Pleiadum spisso cur coit igne chorus; Curve suos fines altum non exeat aequor, Plenus et in partes quattuor annus eat; Sub terris sint iura deum et tormenta Gigantum, &c. The general sense of this passage is so strikingly identical with that of Georg. 2. 475 foll. as to suggest strong sympathy if not imitation. And the words *naturae perdiscere mores* come probably from Georg. 1. 51, *varium caeli praediscere morem*. In the same way the passage about Italy in Propertius 4 (3). 22 may be compared with Georg. 2. 134 foll.

Vergil distinctly says at the beginning of the third Georgic that he means to celebrate the exploits of Octavianus. He never carried out this intention literally, but the Aeneid, which occupied him for the rest of his life, embraced a wider field than he had originally contemplated. The remark of Suetonius that the Aeneid was *argumentum varium ac multiplex et quasi amborum Homeri carminum instar, praeterea nominibus ac rebus Graecis Latinisque commune et, in quo, quod maxime studebat, Romanae simul urbis et Augusti origo contineretur*, contains the gist of much actual and possible criticism. I have endeavoured elsewhere (*Suggestions introductory to a Study of the Aeneid*) to trace out some of the leading ideas which guided Vergil in his treatment of the story; I shall therefore confine myself on the present occasion to making a few remarks on the probable order, so far as this can be ascertained, in which the books of the Aeneid were composed, and to noticing some passages in Propertius which seem to shew that he had seen some of it before it was published, with a few which Vergil apparently took from Horace and Varius.

I cannot suppose that Vergil's desire to burn the Aeneid was occasioned by his sense of his own incapacity to write epic poetry. It is far more likely that, as he says in his letter to Augustus (Macrob. 1. 24. 11), he was conscious of the vastness of the material and the compass of the subject, and felt that he had not had time to mould his conceptions into perfect form. *Tanta incohata res est ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar*. His misgiving would be seriously increased by the reflection that even the outer incidents of the story had not in some important parts been brought into even tolerable harmony

with each other. For Suetonius states that Vergil first drafted the Aeneid in prose and then wrote the various parts in no definite order, but just as the fancy took him: *particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens*. This statement is fully borne out by internal evidence. The inconsistencies and discrepancies between different parts of the Aeneid have been often noticed, by no one to more purpose than by Ribbeck in his *Prolegomena*. The account of Aeneas' wanderings given in the third book cannot be reconciled with that of the first and fifth books. In the third book they are represented as lasting two and a half or three years, in the first and fifth as lasting more than six. Clearly Vergil must have at different times taken up different traditions—there were many in the second-rate mythology which he followed—and had not before his death finally decided which to adopt. Again, at the end of the second book, Creusa the wife of Aeneas is said to have appeared to him after her death and prophesied to him the rise of his kingdom in Italy. Now in the third book, which contains the story of his wanderings immediately after this prophecy was given, there is no mention of it whatever, and yet, had Aeneas remembered it, it would have saved him his voyage to Crete. This glaring inconsistency makes it almost certain that the third book was written before the second.

Again, the fifth book somewhat interferes with the narrative of the fourth and sixth, and contains one notable inconsistency with that of the sixth Aeneid. The sixth book would naturally follow the fourth, for Aeneas intended to go straight from Carthage to Italy, and Dido in the sixth book appears to Aeneas as fresh from the slaughter, *recens a vulnere*. The inconsistency to which I have alluded occurs in the accounts of the death of Palinurus, the steersman of Aeneas. In the fifth book he is drowned in a calm sea by the agency of a god; in the sixth he falls from the helm to which he is clinging in apprehension of the rough weather which is threatening the ship (*tantis surgentibus undis*). This fact so far as it goes tends, I think, to shew that the fifth book was written subsequently to the sixth.

It is improbable, again, that the fifth book was written before the ninth; for in the ninth Nisus and Euryalus are introduced

as if no mention had been made of them before, although they have been already spoken of at length as taking part in the games described in the fifth.

Little can be ascertained as to the actual dates at which different parts of the Aeneid were composed. The lines in the eighth book describing the triple triumph of 29 B.C. can hardly have been written long after that event, and the same may perhaps be conjectured with regard to other passages referring to the same period, as for instance the description of the *ludus Troiae* in the fifth book, and that of the Actian games in 3. 280. I am inclined to think that the third Aeneid was one of the earliest which Vergil completed. That it was written before the first we have already seen; and its style throughout is so inferior to that of any other part of the poem as readily to suggest the idea that it was Vergil's first attempt upon the story of Aeneas. It contains a complete and independent story, that of the wanderings of Aeneas between Troy and Carthage, which, as we have seen, Vergil never harmonized with the conclusion of the second book.

Augustus when absent on the Cantabrian campaign (B.C. 26 and 25) wrote Vergil a half-playful, half-threatening letter, asking the poet to send him the first draft, or if not that, any single passage of the Aeneid. No doubt Suetonius, to whom we owe this information, had before him the same correspondence of which a fragment is preserved by Macrobius. Of Vergil's characteristic reply I have already spoken. It was not until long after this that he consented to read to Augustus three books, two of which were certainly the fourth and the sixth. The sixth book cannot have been recited earlier than B.C. 23, the year in which the young Marcellus died, nor later than 22, when Augustus went to Sicily. No date can be assigned to the reading of the fourth book: nor is it certain whether the other book recited was the first, second, or third.

The sixth book contains allusions to the conquest of the Garamantes and the seventh to the restoration of the Roman standards: (6. 794, *super et Garamantas et Indos Proferet imperium*; 7. 606, *Auroramque sequi Parthosque reposcere signa*). Both these events belong to the year of Vergil's death, 19 B.C.; supposing, that is, that the passage about the Garamantes refers

to the actual triumph of Augustus, not to his campaign of the previous year.

I now come to the point with the consideration of which I shall conclude this essay. It is clear from the testimony of Suetonius that parts of the *Aeneid* had become famous long before Vergil's death, in spite of the fact that like Horace he was particular only to recite to select audiences of friends and critics. I need hardly allude to the well-known lines of Propertius, *Cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graii, Nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, which were written, if Suetonius may be believed, soon after the commencement of Vergil's labours. The language of Propertius shews, I think, that he was one of the favoured circle who were allowed to see the *Aeneid* in progress. The poem in question (3. 26) must have been written in or shortly after the year 26, when the poet Gallus came to his tragical end; and the expressions *Actia litora Phoebi, iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus*, recall the words of Vergil so accurately that it is impossible to suppose that they were not known to Propertius. The *Aeneid* seems also to be distinctly alluded to in 2. 1. 41, *nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos*; and a passage ten lines above in the same poem, *Nilus cum tractus in urbem Septem captivis debilis ibat aquis*, must be compared with Vergil's words written in or referring to the same year, 29 B.C., *Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis*. Again, 5. 3. 32 (B.C. 20 or 19), *lucis et auctores non dare carmen aves*, is strangely like Aen. 8. 455, *Evandrum . . . lux suscitât alma, Et matutini volucrum sub culmine cantus*; so Propertius, *miscabant usta proelia nuda sude* (5. 1. 28), recalls Vergil's *sudibusve praeustis (decernunt)* Aen. 7. 524. There are other expressions common to Vergil and Propertius in poems of the latter, to which no date can apparently be assigned; such are 1. 16. 25, *tu sola humanos numquam miserata labores*, compared with Aen. 1. 597, *O sola infandos Troiae miserata labores*; 2. 5. 3, *dabis mihi perfida poenas*, Aen. 4. 386, *dabis improbe poenas*; 3. 3. 5, *idem non frustra ventosas addidit alas*, Aen. 12. 848, *ventosasque addidit alas*; 4. 21. 12, *remorumque pares ducite sorte vices*, Aen. 3. 510, *sortiti remos*; 4. 7. 49, Aen. 10. 136, *Oricia terebintho*; 5. 2. 8, *hac quondam Tiberinus iter faciebat, et aiunt Remorum auditos per vada pulsa sonos*; 5. 6. 26, *armorum*

radiis picta tremebat aqua, Aen. 8. 92, *miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe Scuta virum fluvio pictasque innare carinas*; 5. 6. 49, *quodque vehunt prorae Centaurica saxa minantes*, Aen. 10. 195, *ingentem remis Centaurum promovet*; *ille Instat aquae, saxumque ingens immane minatur Arduus*. When it is uncertain, as it is in some of these cases, whether Propertius wrote before Vergil's death, it is impossible to be sure which poet is borrowing from the other; but the coincidences are striking in themselves, and may well point to friendship between the two writers.

The same remarks apply to some passages in Horace which were either imitated by Vergil in the Aeneid, or represent the common thoughts of the two poets. *Sed me per hostes Mercurius celer Denso paventem sustulit aere, Te rursus in bellum resorbens Unlla fretis tulit aestuosis* (Od. 2. 7. 14), recalls two passages in the Aeneid, 1. 411, *at Venus obscuro grandientes aere saepsit*, 11. 627, *rapidus retro atque aestu revoluta resorbens Saxa fugit*. Compare also *Sol ubi montium Mutaret umbras* (Od. 3. 6. 41) and Aen. 1. 607, *dum montibus umbrae Lustrabunt convexa*; Sat. 2. 1. 58, *mors atris circumvolat alis*, and Aen. 6. 866, *sed nox atra caput tristi circumvolat umbra*.

From Varius Vergil borrowed Aen. 6. 622, *Vendidit hic auro patriam dominumque potentem Imposuit, fixit leges pretio atque refixit*, and part of 6. 79, *tanto magis ille fatigat Os ravidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo*. Varius had written *Vendidit hic Latium populis, dominumque potentem Imposuit, fixit leges pretio atque refixit*: and speaking of a horse and his rider, *angusto prius ore coercens Insultare docet campis, fingitque morando*.

The chronological results of the foregoing discussion may be summed up in the following table of dates:—

- B.C. 70. Birth of Vergil.
- 65. Birth of Horace.
- 63. Birth of Augustus.
- 56 or 55? Birth of Propertius.
- 55. Vergil takes the *toga virilis*.
- 54 or 53? The seventh poem of the *κατὰ λεπτὸν* and the *Culex*. Vergil begins the study of philosophy.

B.C. 49. Roman citizenship conferred by Julius Caesar on the towns of *Gallia Transpadana*.

43. Earliest date assignable to any of the Eclogues.

42. Battle of Philippi.

41. Confiscations by the triumvirs: Vergil, Propertius, and Tibullus all suffer—Eclogue 9: the tenth poem of the *κατὰ λεπτόν*: Vergil flies to the villa of Siron. Commencement of Vergil's acquaintance with Maecenas.

War of Perusia: (Propertius 1. 21 and 22?).

40. Consulship of Asinius Pollio. Restoration of Vergil to his estate. Eclogues 1. 4. 8: 6?

39. Horace, Odes 2. 1? P. Alfenus (Varus?) *consul suffectus*: Orelli-Henzen Inscr. 6438.

37. Eclogue 10. Vergil and Varius meet Horace at Sinuessa. Construction of the *portus Iulius* by Agrippa. *Terminus a quo* of the Georgics. Phraates ascends the throne of Parthia.

36. Expedition of Antonius against the Parthians. Defeat of Oppius Statianus: Polemo king of Pontus taken prisoner by Phraates: disastrous retreat of Antonius.

35. Discontent of the Medians with Phraates.

34. Occupation of Armenia by the Romans: conquest of Artaxias by the Medians.

33. Roman troops withdrawn from the East: Armenia and Media overrun by Phraates. The Roman empire threatened with civil war. The Suevi cross the Rhine? Georg. 1. 498 foll.; 2. 495 foll. Horace, Odes 1. 2? Epod. 7 and 17?

32. Revolution in Parthia: Phraates driven into exile; his flight to the Scythians. The events of this year

are alluded to in the twelfth poem of the *κατὰ λεπτὸν*, probably also by Horace, Odes i. 26 and 35.

- B.C. 31. Battle of Actium. Octavianus leaves Italy for the East (winter).
30. Settlement of the East by Octavianus. *Georgic* 2. 171-2.
29. Return of Octavianus: divine and human honours decreed to him: his triple triumph. *Georgics* recited to him at Atella. Openings of the first and of the third *Georgics*. Propertius, 4. 8 (9). 53, and elsewhere. Horace, *Od.* 2. 9.
Closing of the temple of Janus by Octavianus.
Aeneid 8. 714 foll. ? i. 289 foll. ?
28. *Aeneid* 3 ? 3. 280, Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis: Propertius, 3 (2). 32, Actia . . . litora Phoebi, &c. ?
27. Title of Augustus conferred upon Octavianus.
26. Augustus leaves Italy for the campaign against the Cantabri, on which he is absent during this and the following year. His correspondence with Vergil.
23. Death of Marcellus. Recitation of *Aeneid* 6 ?
20. Expedition of Augustus to the East. *Aen.* 6. 794. 7. 606.
19. Journey of Vergil to Greece: his death.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

**SUGGESTIONS INTRODUCTORY TO A STUDY OF THE
AENEID. Demy 8vo. Price, Eighteenpence.**

**THE ROMAN SATURA, ITS ORIGINAL FORM IN CON-
NECTION WITH ITS LITERARY DEVELOPMENT.
Demy 8vo. Price, One Shilling.**

Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Books Lately Published.

CICERO. THE PHILIPPIC ORATIONS. With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. *Second Edition.* Demy 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

CICERO. SELECT LETTERS. With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Brasenose College, Oxford. *Second Edition.* Demy 8vo. cloth, 18s.

CICERO. SELECT LETTERS (TEXT). By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 4s.

CICERO DE ORATORE. With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, M.A., Professor of Latin, Owens College, Manchester. Book I. 8vo. cloth. *Just ready.*

CATULLI VERONENSIS LIBER. Iterum recognovit, apparatus criticum prolegomena appendices addidit, Robinson Ellis, A.M. 8vo. cloth, 16s.

CATULLUS. A COMMENTARY ON CATULLUS. By Robinson Ellis, M.A. 8vo. cloth, 16s.

HORACE. With Introductions and Notes. By Edward C. Wickham, M.A., Head Master of Wellington College. Vol. I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. *Second Edition.* Demy 8vo. cloth, 12s.

LIVY, Books I-X. By J. R. Seeley, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, Cambridge. Book I. *Second Edition.* Demy 8vo. cloth, 6s.

PERSIUS. THE SATIRES. With a Translation and Commentary. By John Conington, M.A. Edited by H. Nettleship, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

SELECTIONS FROM THE LESS KNOWN LATIN POETS. By North Pinder, M.A. Demy 8vo. cloth, 15s.

FRAGMENTS AND SPECIMENS OF EARLY LATIN. With Introduction and Notes. By John Wordsworth, M.A., Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. cloth, 18s.

A MANUAL OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY, as applied to the Illustration of Greek and Latin Inflections. By T. L. Papillon, M.A., Fellow of New College. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. cloth, 6s.

MACMILLAN and CO., 30, Bedford Street, Strand, London.